

**Technical Panel
of the
Nebraska Information Technology Commission**

Tuesday, November 2, 2004 - 9:00 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
38th and Holdrege, Lincoln, Nebraska

AGENDA

Meeting Documents:

Click the links in the agenda
or [click here](#) for all documents (xx MB)

1. Roll Call and Meeting Notice
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes* - [September 14, 2004](#)
4. Project Reviews

FY2005-2007 BIENNIAL BUDGET REQUESTS*

- [Project summary sheets](#) (meeting document - 2.7 MB .pdf file)
- [Full text of the projects](#) (additional information)

STATE RECORDS BOARD GRANT APPLICATIONS*

- [Online Employment Application Redesign](#) (DAS - State Personnel Division)

5. Standards and Guidelines

- Set for Public Comment*

Groupware Architecture	Lotus Notes Standards for State Government Agencies Lotus Notes Guidelines for State Government Agencies
Security Architecture	Identity and Access Management Standard for State Government Agencies

6. NITC Strategic Initiatives

- [Draft Strategic Plans](#)

7. Regular Informational Items and Work Group Updates (as needed)

- Accessibility of Information Technology Work Group
- CAP
- Security Work Group
- Statewide Synchronous Video Network Work Group

8. Other Business

9. Next Meeting Date

Tuesday, December 14, 2004

10. Adjourn

* Denotes Action Item

NITC and Technical Panel Websites: <http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/>

Meeting notice posted to the NITC Website: 20 SEP 2004; Date Changed 5 OCT 2004

Meeting notice posted to the [Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar](#): 20 SEP 2004; Date Changed 5 OCT 2004

Agenda posted to the NITC Website: 29 OCT 2004

TECHNICAL PANEL

Tuesday, September 14, 2004 - 9:00 a.m.
Varner Hall - Board Room
38th and Holdrege, Lincoln, Nebraska
PROPOSED MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mike Beach, Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission
Brenda Decker, Department of Administrative Services, State of Nebraska
Christy Horn, University of Nebraska, Compliance Officer
Rick Golden, (alt. for Walter Weir, University of Nebraska)
Steve Schafer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, State of Nebraska

ALTERNATES PRESENT:

Rick Becker, Government I.T. Manager, Chief Information Officer
Steve Henderson, Department of Administrative Services

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kirk Langer, Lincoln Public Schools

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND MEETING NOTICE

In the absence of the chair, Mr. Schafer, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. The meeting notice was posted to the Nebraska Public Meeting Calendar and the NITC web sites on August 20, 2004. The meeting agenda was posted to the NITC web site on September 10, 2004. A quorum was present at the time of roll call.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF AUGUST MINUTES

Mr. Beach moved to approve the [August 17, 2004](#) minutes as presented. Ms. Decker seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Beach-Yes, Decker-Yes, Horn-Yes, Schafer-Abstain, and Golden-Yes. Motion was carried.

PROJECT REVIEWS:

Every two years, the NITC reviews I.T. budget requests and recommendations a prioritized list to the Governor and Legislature. The [timeline](#) was distributed to panel members. Per the recommendation of the Technical Panel, the summary will be given back to the agency and they will be given an opportunity to respond. Copies of the [Project Proposal Form](#), [Reviewer Scoring Sheet](#), and the [Summary Sheet](#) were sent to panel members prior to the meeting for their review.

The list of Project Reviewers was discussed. The list consists of representatives from each of the councils as well as representatives from IMServices, the CIO's office, NOL, Department of Education and the University of Nebraska. Mr. Weir recommended that Don Mihulka also be added to the list. It was recommended by the panel to add a third category: "Other technical experts, as required, with notification via e-mail to Technical Panel members and alternates."

Mr. Beach moved to approve the [Project Reviewers List for FY2005-07 Biennial Budget](#) with the recommended changes. Ms. Decker seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Golden-Yes, Schafer-Yes, Horn-Yes, Decker-Yes, and Beach-Yes. Motion was carried by unanimous vote.

Ms. Horne needed to leave the meeting early, and the Accessibility update was moved up on the agenda.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS - Accessibility. Contact has been made with state to work on implementing strategies. The University is looking at a vendor that will provide text alternatives to web pages. The upfront cost is \$24,000 and then \$3500/year for maintenance costs. Ms. Horn will get vendor information to the panel members.

[NITC DRAFT STRATEGIC PLANS](#)

Mr. Schafer would like the Technical Panel members input and recommendations on the drafts prior to the NITC's final approval. CAP will be looking at Network Nebraska section today at their meeting.

Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network. Under the Recommended Actions section item A.1, it was recommended to

change the lead entity from Collaboration Aggregation Partnership to the Technical Panel.

Network Nebraska. The following recommendations were made for the Recommended Actions section: 6) a. change CAP to the Technical Panel; 7) change sentence to read, "Assess the capacity for administration, billing, and technical support to accommodate additional services and customers"; and 7) a., change date from March 31, 2005 to June 30, 2005.

Statewide Synchronous Video Network. The following recommendations were made for the Recommended Actions section: C.2.c. delete "Funding to complete this task included in Congressional request."; D., change wording in first sentence from "Development of" to "Explore options for"; and E.1.a., change lead from To Be Named to the Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group.

Community IT Planning and Development. Under the Recommended Actions section, third bullet, first sentence change the sentence to reflect that this is a "request."

eLearning. No comments.

Enterprise Architecture for State Government. Mr. Schafer discussed a larger role for the State Government Council in developing the enterprise architecture. The Council would still be required to recommend standards and guidelines to the Technical Panel for review and recommendation to the NITC for final approval. Discussion occurred regarding the exceptions process and the need to address requests in a timely manner. It was recommended that staff develop possible procedures for an exception process involving the Technical Panel to be discussed at the October meeting.

E-Government. Mr. Schafer will contact lead agencies.

Security and Business Resumption. Employee awareness is not addressed but will need to in the future.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:

CAP, Brenda Decker. The group is meeting today.

Security Work Group, Steve Schafer. The Work Group is meeting tomorrow to discuss the scope for the Security Assessment grant.

Statewide Video Synchronous Work Group, Mike Beach. The NITC approved the standard at their September 9th meeting. Much of the group's efforts have been on exploring funding options. The next focus will be on scheduling and coordination.

OTHER

There was no other business.

ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING DATE AND TIME

The next meeting of the NITC Technical Panel will be held on Tuesday, October 12, 2004, 9:00 a.m. in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Ms. Decker moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Golden seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Meeting minutes were taken by Lori Lopez Urdiales and reviewed by Rick Becker of the Office of the CIO/NITC.



Agency Information Technology Projects
FY2005-07 Biennial Budget

November 2004

**NEBRASKA
INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY
COMMISSION**

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
FY2005-2007 Information Technology Project Proposals
(Sorted by Project #)

	Project #	Agency	Project Title	FY2005-06	FY2006-07	Score
1	05-01	Supreme Court	Install Personal Computers for Courts	\$ 294,866	\$ 456,148	85
2	05-02	Supreme Court	Acquire Juvenile Case Management System	\$ 992,737	\$ 342,737	53
3	05-03	Supreme Court	Trial Court Automation Strategy	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	79
4	13-01	Department of Education	Distance Learning—Infrastructure, Programming, and Training	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	85
5	25-01	HHSS	AIMS Conversion to Avatar			71
6	25-02	HHSS	Bio-Terrorism IT			72
7	25-03	HHSS	CHARTS (Children Have A Right To Support)			55
8	25-04	HHSS	Compudata	\$ 536,585		70
9	25-05	HHSS	MMIS (Medicaid Management Information System)		\$ 30,000,000	69
10	25-06	HHSS	N-FOCUS: Nebraska Family On Line Client User System			75
11	25-07	HHSS	Computer Hardware & Software Renewal Policy and Program	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	81
12	25-08	HHSS	Electronic Vital Records System	\$ 281,600	\$ 477,000	76
13	25-09	HHSS	Network Technology Renewal Plan	\$ 655,700		87
14	27-01	Department of Roads	Nebraska Enterprise Centerline Transportation Attribute Resource (NECTAR)			55
15	27-02	Department of Roads	Document Management System			29
16	27-03	Department of Roads	Enterprise Asset Management System			68
17	27-04	Department of Roads	Financial System Update			63
18	27-05	Department of Roads	NIS - Procurement/DOR Financials and Procurement	\$ 900,000		74
19	27-06	Department of Roads	PioneerNET			82
20	27-07	Department of Roads	Project Scheduling & Program Management System			78
21	37-01	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Vocational Rehabilitation	\$ 55,900	\$ 56,290	74
22	37-02	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Coverage and Claims	\$ 58,250	\$ 6,508	72
23	37-03	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Adjudication		\$ 534,066	69
24	51-01	University of Nebraska	University Enterprise Server Upgrade	\$ 925,000	\$ 925,000	92
25	65-01	DAS - CIO	Security Audits	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	92

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
FY2005-2007 Information Technology Project Proposals
(Sorted by Review Score)

	Project #	Agency	Project Title	FY2005-06	FY2006-07	Score
1	51-01	University of Nebraska	University Enterprise Server Upgrade	\$ 925,000	\$ 925,000	92
2	65-01	DAS - CIO	Security Audits	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	92
3	25-09	HHSS	Network Technology Renewal Plan	\$ 655,700		87
4	05-01	Supreme Court	Install Personal Computers for Courts	\$ 294,866	\$ 456,148	85
5	13-01	Department of Education	Distance Learning—Infrastructure, Programming, and Training	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	85
6	27-06	Department of Roads	PioneerNET			82
7	25-07	HHSS	Computer Hardware & Software Renewal Policy and Program	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	81
8	05-03	Supreme Court	Trial Court Automation Strategy	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000	79
9	27-07	Department of Roads	Project Scheduling & Program Management System			78
10	25-08	HHSS	Electronic Vital Records System	\$ 281,600	\$ 477,000	76
11	25-06	HHSS	N-FOCUS: Nebraska Family On Line Client User System			75
12	27-05	Department of Roads	NIS - Procurement/DOR Financials and Procurement Interface	\$ 900,000		74
13	37-01	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Vocational Rehabilitation	\$ 55,900	\$ 56,290	74
14	25-02	HHSS	Bio-Terrorism IT			72
15	37-02	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Coverage and Claims	\$ 58,250	\$ 6,508	72
16	25-01	HHSS	AIMS Conversion to Avatar			71
17	25-04	HHSS	Computata	\$ 536,585		70
18	25-05	HHSS	MMIS (Medicaid Management Information System)		\$ 30,000,000	69
19	37-03	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Adjudication		\$ 534,066	69
20	27-03	Department of Roads	Enterprise Asset Management System			68
21	27-04	Department of Roads	Financial System Update			63
22	25-03	HHSS	CHARTS (Children Have A Right To Support)			55
23	27-01	Department of Roads	Nebraska Enterprise Centerline Transportation Attribute Resource (NECTAR)			55
24	05-02	Supreme Court	Acquire Juvenile Case Management System	\$ 992,737	\$ 342,737	53
25	27-02	Department of Roads	Document Management System			29

Nebraska Information Technology Commission
FY2005-2007 Information Technology Project Proposals
(Sorted by Agency Priority Ranking)

Project #	Agency	Project Title	Agency Priority	Score
05-02	Supreme Court	Acquire Juvenile Case Management System	1	53
05-01	Supreme Court	Install Personal Computers for Courts	2	85
05-03	Supreme Court	Trial Court Automation Strategy	3	79
25-05	HHSS	MMIS (Medicaid Management Information System)	1	69
25-06	HHSS	N-FOCUS: Nebraska Family On Line Client User System	2	75
25-03	HHSS	CHARTS (Children Have A Right To Support)	3	55
25-07	HHSS	Computer Hardware & Software Renewal Policy and	4	81
25-09	HHSS	Network Technology Renewal Plan	5	87
25-02	HHSS	Bio-Terrorism IT	6	72
25-01	HHSS	AIMS Conversion to Avatar	7	71
25-04	HHSS	Computata	8	70
25-08	HHSS	Electronic Vital Records System	9	76
27-05	Department of Roads	NIS - Procurement/DOR Financials and Procurement Interface	1	74
27-04	Department of Roads	Financial System Update	2	63
27-07	Department of Roads	Project Scheduling & Program Management System	3	78
27-06	Department of Roads	PioneerNET	4	82
27-03	Department of Roads	Enterprise Asset Management System	5	68
27-01	Department of Roads	Nebraska Enterprise Centerline Transportation Attribute Resource (NECTAR)	6	55
27-02	Department of Roads	Document Management System	7	29
37-01	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Vocational Rehabilitation	1	74
37-02	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Coverage and Claims	2	72
37-03	Workers Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Adjudication	3	69

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #05-01
Page 1 of 3

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Supreme Court	Install Personal Computers for Courts	\$294,866.00	\$456,148.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

Sections 24-228, R.S.S. 2003 (District Court) and 24-514, R.R.S. 1943 (County Court) provide the statutory basis for furnishing equipment to the trial courts.

Dedicated terminals were installed for all district and county court employees as JUSTICE was deployed. Subsequently, most organizations have switched to personal computers rather than terminals. The AS/400 has evolved, dropping Office Vision, which courts used via their terminals for E-Mail, word processing, and calendars. After exploring options, the JUSTICE team agreed with IMS to use standard E-mail, Outlook, and Microsoft Word to replace Office Vision. This will require personal computers rather than terminals. Personal computers will also be required to display graphical images, including documents which have been electronically filed or scanned and stored as images. PCs will also be required to allow JUSTICE to move to a graphical interface.

Courthouses have been rewired statewide to support IP communications. At least one personal computer has been installed in every court to allow the court to be in contact via E-mail. We must now complete the replacement of terminals.

Judges and their staff members (some district judges have bailiffs, secretaries, or both) require personal computers to efficiently complete their work and take full advantage of some JUSTICE enhancements. This plan includes the cost of providing a personal computer to every trial court judge and every court employee.

Computers are leased through the Department of Administrative Services. A dedicated terminal costs \$24 per month; a personal computer costs \$56 per month, and a laptop personal computer costs about \$85 per month. We plan to replace about one third of the remaining dedicated terminals each year during the 2005 fiscal year, which will increase costs by \$121,960 including the new DAS E-Mail service. This cost increases to just over \$254,000 when all terminals have been replaced.

Personal computers will be installed for each trial court judge and staff member beginning in July, 2005, and is expected to cost \$117,000 with E-Mail service in fiscal 2006 and about \$155,500 in the next and subsequent years.

Please note the Court will make a separate request in the expansion budget to place personal computers in courtrooms to allow courts to use a new JUSTICE enhancement to streamline the workflow of the courts and eliminate repetitive data entry. Those personal computers are not included in this request.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Total
5. Training		\$ 12,000.00				\$ 12,000.00
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware	\$ 190,080.00	\$ 281,708.00	\$ 454,646.00	\$ 454,646.00	\$ 454,646.00	\$ 1,835,726.00
8.4 Other		\$ 1,158.00	\$ 1,502.00	\$ 1,502.00	\$ 1,502.00	\$ 5,664.00
TOTAL COSTS	\$ 190,080.00	\$ 294,866.00	\$ 456,148.00	\$ 456,148.00	\$ 456,148.00	\$ 1,853,390.00
Cash Funds	\$ 190,080.00	\$ 294,866.00	\$ 456,148.00	\$ 456,148.00	\$ 456,148.00	\$ 1,853,390.00
TOTAL FUNDS	\$ 190,080.00	\$ 294,866.00	\$ 456,148.00	\$ 456,148.00	\$ 456,148.00	\$ 1,853,390.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	13	14	13.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	24	23	24	23.7	25
V: Technical Impact	19	19	18	18.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	8	8	8.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	8	7	8.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	13	16	13.0	20
TOTAL				85	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Goals are valid and need to be met. This project should be considered a requirement. - Project objectives address a critical underlying infrastructure need that is prerequisite to accomplishing the business related objectives of the court. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not sure whether this project is listed in their Information Technology plan.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All statements are valid. Old terminals are obsolete. - Technology being replaced is obsolete and unavailable. Failure to implement the project places the court at considerable future risk. Where PC's used to be a luxury, they are now a standard part of all technical infrastructures. 	
V: Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most popular software is planned for these systems. Implies systems will be replaced every 3 years which is common. Move to IP network is also the standard for State Networks. - The court is simply extending their technical strategy that is already in place and is proven successful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Doesn't list specific hardware brand, models, speed, etc. Assumption is the hardware will be the latest technology. - The project addresses one technical infrastructure layer and does not discuss or reference other critical areas such as high speed communications.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Looks like there is sufficient support for the project, both from the Supreme Court and from IM Services. Proposed training should be sufficient for most people, but some may need more than just computer based training. - Project sponsor is identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Milestones/deliverables not defined. Preliminary implementation plan could use more definition. - Does not discuss judges acceptability of PC's on their desks and the willingness to use the future applications that they will support.
VII: Risk Assessment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are probably additional risks related to training and education. - Risks such as the ability of court staff dependant on technology to perform their duties because of the failure of existing "terminal equipment" and the delay in implementing future business objectives could have been elaborated on.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leasing provides a good mechanism to place equipment under an equipment replacement cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although financial information is provided, it does not detail the hardware that will be purchased. Can not determine if spending is appropriate without the detail on number of devices that will be purchased. No answers to questions to 16 and 17. - Terms of lease were not discussed so could not determine whether Yrs 2 through 4 were locked in by agreement or if inflation was taken into account. Details in Executive Summary do provide additional information. Location in budget request not identified.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #05-02
Page 1 of 3

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Supreme Court	Acquire Juvenile Case Management System	\$ 992,737.00	\$ 342,737.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

A review of Juvenile case processing by the Supreme Court's Court Improvement Project (CIP) Coordinator resulted in recommendations to better monitor individual case processes, overall court processing times, and better track individuals. The State Court Administrator decided to acquire and install a separate juvenile case management system for the use of the three Separate Juvenile Courts and possibly for the county courts which sit as juvenile courts. This decision was made to avoid development efforts needed to provide this functionality and so the system can be delivered quickly.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Total
1. Personnel Costs		\$ 137,737.00	\$ 137,737.00	\$ 137,737.00	\$ 137,737.00	\$ 550,948.00
7. Other Operating Costs		\$ 75,000.00	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 375,000.00
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware		\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 120,000.00
8.2 Software		\$ 750,000.00	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 975,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	\$ -	\$ 992,737.00	\$ 342,737.00	\$ 342,737.00	\$ 342,737.00	\$ 2,020,948.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	12	4	9.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	15	20	9	14.7	25
V: Technical Impact	14	13	0	9.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	5	7	4	5.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	9	4	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	10	7	9.0	20
TOTAL				53	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The section on goals and objectives provides a detailed list of requirements. - Project proposal seeks to improve juvenile court case monitoring by the courts. This would promote the court's oversight of juveniles involved in abuse and neglect cases. - There are direct recommendations for some functionality from ASFA but that does not necessarily transfer to specifications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Agency IT plan presents two projects relating to juvenile case processing. One is to acquire a separate system to serve the juvenile courts. The other is the modification of JUSTICE. It is not clear how these two options will be evaluated. What criteria will be used to choose between the two options? - The project cites the Supreme Court's Court Improvement Project, and specifies court compliance with the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) as justification for the request. However, federal and state law mandates that compliance with ASFA requirements as specified in the Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) is the sole function of the Department of Health and Human Services. ASFA

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		<p>does not mandate court processing requirements. The goals and objectives specified in this section are SACWIS requirements currently under development by the Department of Health and Human Services. Their development by the courts would be duplicative, and could not be submitted to the federal government as evidence of compliance. As the federal and state ASFA agency, only HHSS can report to the federal government, and federal compliance reviews will be of the HHSS system. The burden of compliance and potential loss of funding does not fall on the court.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No discussion of examining options. Replacement of JUSTICE outside of counties without separate juvenile courts unclear.
<p>IV: Project Justification / Business Case</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvement in the court's case juvenile processing system will allow better management of juvenile cases. The project recommends "a needs analysis...to identify system enhancements that are needed/desired by the larger court system...within the state's unified court system." The CIP report listed three options as detailed in the proposal. These options should be pursued prior to the purchase of a software system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The primary justification appears to be compliance with the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act. What is the deadline for complying, and how will the federal government enforce this mandate? Do any metrics exist that illustrate the extent and severity of problems in Nebraska? The CIP consultants presented three options for further evaluation. That evaluation is essential to developing the business case. - While noting the need for a comprehensive study, this proposal appears to acquire a system first, and then determine court needs. Within the proposal, there is no discussion of how the new juvenile system would integrate with the 90 county courts sitting as juvenile courts that currently use JUSTICE as the case management system. Even assuming that the court would meet the ASFA requirements, there is no discussion on how the court would report their results to HHSS for subsequent reporting to the federal government. - The long term assessment seems key to the recommendations but it is not clear if it will be included in his project.
<p>V: Technical Impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relies on consultant's recommendations (assuming they are solid) while acknowledging many unknowns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project will impact JUSTICE and the interfaces with major systems in other agencies. The magnitude of the impact, including costs, should be evaluated before choosing a solution. - This section does not describe a technical impact, and only references "Web-based system" technology. - Why web-based? (no evaluation of other options in IV) An RFI would have provided a lot of information on feasibility and options as well as the information requested in #7. Detailed specifications & requirements needed. HHSS may have a lot of that data.
<p>VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal describes a supreme court effort to identify juvenile court requirements. - Commercial acquisition can address many support issues. Committee review will allow for broad input but an RFP is time consuming. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information regarding milestones, deliverables, training, and ongoing support are not known. - Absent a comprehensive plan for juvenile courts, the project fails to detail an implementation plan. Rather, the plan seeks to acquire a new system but lacks detail on the functions that the system must provide. - Specification development processes, product reviews (RFI, vendor queries, etc) and interface specifications should be discussed at length. While commercial application can ease many aspects there is a lot of up front work required.
<p>VII: Risk Assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal correctly lists risk factors and potential complications for the courts unified court system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some of the requirements of the new system, such as tracking relationships among individuals are similar to functionality in the N-FOCUS system

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	<p>- Recognizes the difficulties in customizing COTS software.</p>	<p>maintained by HHS. Duplication of functions and data would create another risk of keeping information in both systems synchronized and accurate. There is also a risk that the new system may not support the many interfaces that now exist between JUSTICE and systems in other agencies.</p> <p>- The supreme court has announced support for a juvenile court system modeled after drug courts. The project request contemplates the acquisition of a computing system, yet neither the CIP report nor the project request addresses how the system would be used to support the proposed new juvenile court system. Presumably, the new juvenile court structure would place more emphasis on intervention, treatment, and family services. This would imply that courts would work closely with the service provider, perhaps in a role other than adjudication. A new technology system should be developed to support the new court structure once it is defined.</p>
<p>VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget</p>	<p>- Services delivered to juveniles is currently a high priority to the state, and the juvenile courts are an integral part of these services. This project has the potential to improve judicial oversight of those services. Rather than simply purchase software, an alternative project would be for the courts to work directly with HHSS to clearly define the role of the juvenile court when modeled after a drug court and its relationship to HHSS as the primary service provider. Further, the court could assist with the state's compliance with ASFA by partnering with HHSS to to define how the courts could assist with the implementation of SACWIS requirements, including data exchange, document creation, storage and retrieval, case tracking and compliance, and notifications of pending court actions. Further, the project should include court interfaces to HHSS case tracking, case management, Indian child welfare, and intervention plans for use by the court in reviewing compliance. The supreme court has expressed a need to reexamine its role in the juvenile justice system, perhaps beyond adjudication. A technology request should identify requirements to meet this new vision. There is a need to strengthen the existing juvenile court system. This project appears to transfer the burden of ASFA compliance from the agency designated with that responsibility to the courts.</p>	<p>- What is the basis for the \$750,000 estimate for a new system. Does this amount include costs for configuration or modifications to meet Nebraska's requirements? Does it include the cost of data conversion or interfaces?</p> <p>- The budget request is composed of two major components, personnel and technology. The request is for the purchase of software licenses and support systems. The cost of integrating this juvenile system with the court's case management system is not addressed, even though these concerns are raised in the project narrative.</p> <p>- No breakdowns. Unclear if staff will develop specs, write RFP, train, implement, etc. Probably unable to make acquisition in one year. No justification or source for cost estimates (acquisition or ongoing or staff) and unknowns (hardware, roll-out, etc).</p>

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #05-03
Page 1 of 2

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Supreme Court	Trial Court Automation Strategy	\$ 125,000.00	\$ 125,000.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

JUSTICE, the current trial court automation system, was designed and built in the early 1990s. Dramatic changes in technology have occurred, but JUSTICE has not been modified to include many of those advances. The Court asks for funds to retain an expert, independent consultant. The result will be a review of how well JUSTICE satisfies the needs of trial courts, and will provide guidance in deciding how long to expect to continue to use JUSTICE and when the Court should move to a new automation system using the latest technology.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Total
2. Contractual Services						
2.4 Other	\$ -	\$ 125,000.00	\$ 125,000.00			\$ 250,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	\$ -	\$ 125,000.00	\$ 125,000.00			\$ 250,000.00
General Funds		\$ 125,000.00	\$ 125,000.00			\$ 250,000.00
TOTAL FUNDS		\$ 125,000.00	\$ 125,000.00			\$ 250,000.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	14	11	12.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	14	20	20	18.0	25
V: Technical Impact	16	18	20	18.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	7	8	7.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	9	8	8	8.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	13	15	16	14.7	20
TOTAL				79	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The goals and projected outcomes are clear. The proposed study is an essential part of the life cycle of IT investments. A periodic evaluation of requirements, costs, best practices, and options is important. - Goals, etc. are well defined. Door to enhancing existing Justice System was left open. Development of a long range technical plan is critical to the success of the trial court system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project outcomes should include a cost benefit study of the different options under consideration (modify JUSTICE, build a replacement system, buy a replacement system, or do nothing). The study should look at potential changes to processes that would improve the operations of county and district courts. - Measurement methods are too general to assure that the consultant is progressing successfully. In reviewing the Supreme Courts IT Comprehensive Plan, I could not find direct discussion about the need to take a comprehensive look at the trial court system.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This section should list specific deficiencies with JUSTICE cited in the studies by the National Center for State Courts and National Center for Juvenile Justice. How significant are these

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #05-03
Page 2 of 2

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		deficiencies? What are some of the major features of the ASFA as they impact courts? - While this section discussed the benefits of a "revitalized" trial court system, it did not answer the question "Why use an outside consultant?". Likewise the other solution did not discuss the use of existing court staff to perform the analysis.
V: Technical Impact	- Analysis projects of this type do not typically have an immediate technical impact, so I awarded all points.	- The impact on other systems that share data with JUSTICE should also be addressed.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Project sponsor was identified. At this point in the project definition stated milestones and deliverables are adequate.	- What is the projected timeline for the study? Will external stakeholders (attorneys, prosecutors, law enforcement) be involved? - There was not a statement that the stakeholders have "bought into" participating in the project.
VII: Risk Assessment	- Risks were well stated.	- Each risk could have been addressed individually with respect to mitigation.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- Will the \$250,000 amount be adequate for the scope of services? Some comparison with other studies would help to determine if this amount is reasonable. Section VII indicated that the State Court Administrator would provide temporary court staff to allow participation of senior staff in the study. Is this cost included in the \$250,000? - Detail was not provided to determine if costs such as travel, lodging, etc. are included in the cost projection. Detail was not provided to determine whether temporary staff costs are included. Location in budget request not identified.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #13-01
Page 1 of 3

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Education	Distance Learning—Infrastructure, Programming, and Training	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Distance Learning—Infrastructure, Programming and Training Project intends to capitalize on the three strategic initiatives of the NITC in order to improve the access, content and training opportunities of distance learning to address the essential education expectations for all Nebraska schools. These initiatives include:

- **Network Nebraska.** The primary objective of Network Nebraska is to develop a broadband, scalable telecommunications infrastructure that optimizes the quality of service to every public entity in the State of Nebraska. Potential benefits of Network Nebraska include lower network costs, greater efficiency, interoperability of systems providing video courses and conferencing, increased collaboration among educational entities, and better use of public investments. Specific technologies required: Network routers that can ensure differentiated qualities of service for various data applications.
- **Statewide Synchronous Video Network.** This initiative will establish an Internet Protocol-based, high bandwidth network that will interconnect all existing and future distance learning and videoconferencing facilities in the state. Benefits include greater sharing of educational courses and resources; more efficient use of available resources; and one-to-many videoconferencing capabilities for alerts and emergency situations. Specific technologies required: School site routers, Aggregation point routers, School site Codecs (Coder-Decoders), School LAN upgrades, Distance learning scheduling/management system.
- **Nebraska eLearning Initiative.** This initiative will promote the effective and efficient integration of technology into the instructional process and will utilize server-based course management software to deliver enhanced educational opportunities through web-based instruction. A standards-based eKnowledge repository will provide students and teachers equitable access to rich instructional resources. Specific technologies required: Primary and Secondary course management software servers, Digital content library, School site content servers, eKnowledge repository server.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Network Nebraska

Account Description	FY 06 Adj Req	FY 07 Adj Req	Ongoing
Backbone Transport Costs (preK-12)	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,500,000
Subtotal	\$ 500,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,500,000

Statewide Synchronous Video Network

Account Description	FY 06 Adj Req	FY 07 Adj Req	Ongoing
School Site Router Hardware	\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 0
School Site Router Maintenance	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000
Aggregation Point Router Hardware	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 0	\$ 0
Aggregation Router Maintenance	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
School Site Codec Hardware	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 0
School site Codec Maintenance	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
Ancillary Equipment/LAN upgrades	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 500,000
Scheduling/Management system	\$ 745,000	\$ 725,000	\$ 350,000
Training and Support	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
Subtotal	\$ 6,395,000	\$ 5,575,000	\$ 1,700,000

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #13-01
Page 2 of 3

eLearning Initiative and Knowledge Repository

Account Description	FY 06 Adj Req	FY 07 Adj Req	Ongoing
Course Mgt Software Licensing	\$ 60,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 160,000
Primary, Secondary Server/Licensing	\$ 175,000	\$ 330,000	\$ 295,000
Discovery Digital content library	\$ 125,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000
Site-based content servers	\$ 1,650,000	\$ 1,650,000	\$ 0
Content server installation	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 0
Training and Support	\$ 245,000	\$ 245,000	\$ 245,000
eKnowledge Repository	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000
Acute content shortage resources	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000
Subtotal	\$ 3,105,000	\$ 3,425,000	\$ 1,500,000

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	14	14	13.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	25	20	25	23.3	25
V: Technical Impact	16	20	18	18.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	8	9	7.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	8	10	8.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	15	19	14.7	20
TOTAL				85	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative provides a good overview of the scope and intent of the project. - Strong tie to the objectives of the Ed Council - Outcomes and beneficiaries very well defined. Outcomes are clearly in line with current NITC direction of Network Nebraska in terms of traffic aggregation, collaboration and open standards support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative does not include any indication of how the content will be provided. The infrastructure must be put in place to deliver content, however, the content must be readily available and it is not clear how this content will be developed. - Statewide scheduling system is not a given and may not be needed; proposal seems very "centralized" compared to a more robust, regionalized, redundant which would be more a efficient transport bandwidth. - While measurement and assessment methods do appear to be a bit weak they are simply a construct of methods from other projects which are well defined. While this is nominally a weakness it is not a functional problem.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative provides solid fiscal and technical justification for moving forward with this proposal. - The potential benefits to the project are truly phenomenal. In addition to the well stated benefits of the project there is a significant but more esoteric benefit to be gleaned. This project would play a significant role in bridging the digital divide not only from an education perspective but also in a secondary way from an economic development perspective. The presence of high bandwidth IP services in local telco/cable COs will facilitate availability of those services to business, local government and private customers as well as K12. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overlooks the value of the current installed infrastructure when only states \$20M; tendency to oversell benefits--may not be lower network costs; expand on opportunities there will be; minimizes tech support/role of ESUs; QoS of "carts"--don't oversell
V: Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative provides information on how the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative does not adequately provide an

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Impact	<p>proposed technology offers a better technical fit for K12 schools along with an indication of the greater cost-effectiveness of this solution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better use of current bandwidth; in line with current state standards/recommendations - Distance learning specifications are well defined for a document at this level 	<p>indication of how "server farms" will be used and the content they will house. Most importantly, ongoing costs of these server farms are not mentioned nor is there any indication of inducements for teachers to provide content.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Network design vague; providers may determine design and price based on \$\$ available; centralized vs. distributed design a concern (related to eLearning initiative). - E-Learning implementation guidelines are not well defined. While a general plan is in place no standards are specified to guarantee interoperability or upgrade protection.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative addresses the minimum technical information with some mention of the content that will be delivered. - For a document at this level of development this is fine - though obviously there is a tremendous amount of detail work and problem solving that is glossed over. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative does not adequately address incentives for content development or how this will be funded. - overly optimistic about moving remaining schools not using statewide backbone--July 1, 2005 not possible.
VII: Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative provides some overview of likely barriers to adoption as the local level. - There are very few risks to this approach from a technology point of view. In fact - this approach moves from a very high-risk implementation (the current non standardized aging implementation) to a standardized lower risk model. The assessment that risk will be in terms of end user buy-in is very accurate and seems to be appropriately anticipated and addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative does not adequately factor in the likely resistance of those urban districts that may not see the value of distance learning within their district. - overlooks power of local control attitude of local regional DL coordinators; big political battle looms.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative provides an accurate overview of how the proposed monies will be spent. - Seems to be reasonable assuming skilled and progressive project management. Good project management and implementation team leadership will be an absolute key to both functionality and staying under budget. This cannot be done in a business as usual fashion but must be designed up as a scalable open standards based future proofed solution - which is not a model that K12 has consistently adopted in the past. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The notion of achieving postalization of Internet rates in this fashion puts the State in a position of funding schools differentially. Further, unless the plan is tied to consolidation practices the full economic benefit cannot be realized. Finally, no incentive is provided to urban districts that might be interested in producing content if there were financial incentives. - without knowing actual network design, costs of network questionable; schedule system dollars need not established.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	AIMS Conversion to Avatar		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

AIMS TO AVATAR – REGIONAL CENTER INFORMATION SYSTEM

- Lincoln Regional Center, Hastings Regional Center, and Norfolk Regional Center and Beatrice State Development Center are engaged in a State Psychiatric Hospital data system conversion from “Advanced Institutional Management Systems” (AIMS) to the Creative Socio-Medics (CSM) Corporation software called “Avatar”. The goal of this project is to replace existing functionality for a system that is being discontinued and establish a standard electronic patient record. The Avatar system will include modules that address practice management, clinician workstation, and client funds management.

FUNDING SUMMARY

**SCHEDULE 2(a)
 CSM PROGRAMS**

License Products	Qty (1)	Unit Cost	Cost	Annual Maintenance
AVATAR (2)				
Patient/Practice Management	Site wide		\$ 284,800	\$ 56,960
Clinician Workstation	Site wide		587,400	17,480
Patient Trust Funds	Site wide		43,200	8,640
HL7 Interface	3	\$ 25,000	75,000	15,000
Wiley Libraries (4)	100			15,000
Total Avatar Licenses			\$990,400	\$113,080
AIMS Purchase Credits			(750,000)	
Net License Costs			\$ 240,400	\$ 113,080

- Quantity represents named users or login with access rights to the CSM Programs; provided on a site-wide basis for the PM, CWS and Trust Funds applications
- Avatar licenses will be installed on separate databases or servers for each of the following facilities:
 - Beatrice State Developmental Center*
 - Hastings Regional Center*
 - Lincoln Regional Center*
 - Norfolk Regional Center*
 - Central Office or other location (test server installation)
- Wiley libraries are acquired on an annual fee basis; a total of 100 books comprised of as many as four libraries may be acquired under this Agreement. Additional copies may be purchased for a period of two years from the date of this agreement for an annual fee of \$150 per book.

Licensee may acquire the following products for a period of two years at the following prices:

PRODUCT	QTY	UNIT COST	TOTAL COST	ANNUAL FEE
SQL Middleware	6 facilities	\$ 8,700	\$ 52,200	\$ 10,440
Set-Up Fees	N/A	N/A	\$ 15,000	
Master Patient Index	1	15,000	15,000	3,000

**SCHEDULE 2(b)
 THIRD PARTY PROGRAMS**

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-01
Page 2 of 4

DESCRIPTION

<u>3rd Party Licenses</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Unit Cost</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Annual Maintenance</u>
InterSystems Cache' Version 4.1.3 for Windows 2000	253 (1)	\$ 510	\$129,030	\$28,387
Total 3rd Party Licenses	253		\$129,030	\$28,387

Note:

- Quantity reflects concurrent processes required to support the number of named users distributed across the number of databases/servers defined in Schedule 2(a), inclusive of a test server. Total represents 229 defined concurrent application processes and 24 test user processes.

SCHEDULE 2(d)

INSTALLATION SERVICES

<u>Professional Services</u>	<u>Qty</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Project Management	1440	\$ 188	\$ 270,000
Software Installation/Engineering (1)	96	\$ 175	\$ 16,800
Training of Trainers (2)	480	\$ 150	\$ 72,000
End-User Training (3)	160	\$ 150	\$ 24,000
Implementation Services			
File Build Consulting	130	\$ 150	\$ 19,500
RADPlus Forms Development	160	\$ 150	\$ 24,000
Go-Live Support (4)	320	\$ 150	\$ 48,000
Grand Total – Installation Services	2786		\$474,300

GAP Analysis Credit

(\$30,000)

Total Installation Services

\$444,300

Optional Services (5)

Project Management for Rollout	720	\$ 188	\$ 135,000
End-User Training	480	\$ 150	\$ 72,000

This issue updated 3-11-04	Regional Centers and BSDC	Total to Date Invoice & Payments	Annual Software Maintenance
AVATAR Product Licenses - Schedule 2a			
Practice Management	\$284,800		\$56,960
Clinician Workstation + Order Entry	\$587,400		\$17,480
Client Funds Management System	\$43,200		\$8,640
Wiley Libraries (4) 100 user manuals @ 150.00 per HL-7 Interfaces: Outbound LifeCare Pharmacy/ ADT + Reports	\$75,000		\$15,000
AIMS Purchase Credits and Enhancement Fees	-\$750,000		\$15,000
Total CSM License Costs	\$240,400		\$113,080
Total with Enhancement Fees of \$16,233.00			\$129,313
Database License - Schedule 2b			
Third Party Cache Licenses (253x\$510 concurrent users)	\$129,030		\$28,387
Total Third Party Licence	\$129,030		\$28,387
Professional Services Fees - Schedule 2d			
Project Management	\$270,000.00		
Project Management for Rollout			
Software Installation / Engineering	\$16,800		
Training- Technical Support	\$0		
Training the Key Users	\$0		
Training the Trainers	\$72,000		
Training the End Users	\$24,000		
Implementation Services			

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-01
Page 3 of 4

File Build Consultation	\$19,500		
RADPlus Forms Development	\$24,000		
Go-Live Support	\$48,000		
<i>GAP Analysis Credit</i>	-\$30,000		
Total Professional Services	\$444,300		
<hr/>			
Software Development - Schedule 2(e)			
GAP Analysis Items	\$108,220		
SQL Reporting	\$40,260		
Interface Development	\$39,600		
Conversion	\$19,800		
Order Entry Conversion	\$19,800		
Total Development Costs	\$227,680		
Expenses for Travel and Living	\$50,000		
Total Contract Budget	\$1,091,410		\$157,700
<hr/>			
Federal Reporting (50 Veterans Home Reports)	\$0		
Servers(6)	\$90,000.0		
Desktops	\$3,300.0		
Crystal Reports (2 copies)	\$3,200.0		
LifeCare Pharmacy Interface Delivery Costs	\$100,000.0		
Network Cable	\$6,000.0		
Data Communication Costs	\$0.0		\$2,400
Software Escrow Agreement	\$250.0		\$2,400
Total Additional Costs			
<hr/>			
OPTIONS			
PDA (350 per)			
SQL Middleware for 5 facilities	\$52,200		\$10,440
Set Up Fees	\$1,500		
Master Patient Index	\$15,000		\$3,000
Data Warehouse			
Oracle Standard Edition for MPI	\$11,250		1856

Annual Maintenance (4 facilities)

45475

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	10	10	11.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	18	16	16	16.7	25
V: Technical Impact	18	10	13	13.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	5	6	6.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	7	5	6	6.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	19	18	13	16.7	20
TOTAL				71	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals and objectives listed	- Measurement / assessment seem more like expected outcomes. Connection to agency comprehensive IT plan not clear. - No discussion on beneficiaries and expected outcomes
IV: Project	- Support from LB 1083 for reform and current	- Not a lot of information provided.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-01
Page 4 of 4

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Justification / Business Case	product is not supported	- Tangible and intangible benefits not clear. No alternatives solutions described.
V: Technical Impact	- Use of test server to work out issues before implementing into live systems. - Appears to be extensive technical information taken from the Avatar implementation information	- Nothing expressed about future growth / adaptation plans. - No specific technical information on what will be used for this project. Lots of options given. Minimum standards listed in Avatar manuals will limit the actual usefulness of the equipment. Not enough information to determine if equipment will be appropriate for all tasks. Information provided for #8 is actually a continuation of expected answer for #7 (technical description). No discussion on reliability, security and scalability.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Training and implementation responsibilities are detailed. Deliverables and timeline are detailed. - Good list of stakeholders and project members. Extensive milestone task list, but there are questions on dates. Support information appears to be from contract and appears to be related to the contract support.	- Doesn't really explain the preliminary plan. Dates in timeline indicate this project will be almost complete before the funding is available in July 2005. No mention of support for hardware or any other future needs.
VII: Risk Assessment	- Indications of a gap analysis (however it was over 2 years ago).	- Risks / barriers not identified. - Barriers and risks not included.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Capital budget very detailed. Operational budget described in detail. - Extensive financial information provided. Appears to be directly out of the contract.	- Is there room in their operational budget for these ongoing costs? - No discussion on increased FTE support. Moving from a single AS400 to multiple, decentralized intel servers will probably require more personnel time. No discussion on replacement costs.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	Bio-Terrorism IT		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

Bio-terrorism threats have prompted a variety of technology needs. Today there are two major systems and IT supporting roles for BT. First, the National Disease Surveillance System (NEDSS) is a CDC based system to advance the development of efficient, integrated, and interoperable disease surveillance at federal, state and local levels. Second is the Health Alert Network (HAN) that is an essential system developed by HHSS to communicate critical information rapidly to Nebraska's health care partners.

During the next three years, the technology will be aimed at providing better and more secure communications among all the state partners. There will be needs for better data bases to work from. Systems will have to be more secure with redundancy built in.

FUNDING SUMMARY

HHSS BT money expected in FY05 ranges from \$9-18 million. Similar amounts may be available in FY06 and FY07. The amount for technology has not yet been determined.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	10	15	12.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	20	15	25	20.0	25
V: Technical Impact	15	12	13	13.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	5	6	5.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	5	8	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	12	12	20	14.7	20
TOTAL				72	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expands communications to larger part of Nebraska health sector. - The objectives of the project were laid out as to what they planned to do. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No measurement / assessment methods to define success. No relationship to agency comprehensive IT plan given. - The goals were not identified very clearly and the beneficiaries were not included at all.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Federal funds used to minimize direct fiscal impact to Nebraska. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specific benefits not clear. Alternatives not clear. - The four lines that were provided in this area did not address any of the questions related to justification. I could never tell if this was a federal mandate or not. Even the wording indicates that the initiatives were not well defined.
V: Technical Impact		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technology and implementation not clear. Future growth / adaptation not clear. - There were no technical initiatives described. Nothing in the document indicated reliability, security or scalability for anything being described. - Very little information was provided.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No list of deliverables or timeline. No training or staff development planned. - There is no plan included.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-02
Page 2 of 2

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
VII: Risk Assessment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very little information was provided. - Only risk / barrier identified is state policy. - The entire project appears to be described as a risk.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Substantial federal funds available for the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No specific costs listed. How much state money is being requested? No ongoing costs listed. - There is no financial analysis or budget. The entire proposal appears to be a place holder for the possibility of getting BioTerrorism dollars.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	CHARTS (Children Have A Right To Support)		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

CHARTS (Children Have A Right To Support) is designed to support centralized collection and disbursement of Child Support payments. Previously, child support collection and disbursement is handled by Clerks of the District Court in each county. The Federal government, through the 1996 PRWORA (Welfare Reform) legislation mandates centralization of child support collection/disbursement. Programming of CHARTS was completed in 2001 and implemented in December 2001.

Nebraska was required to implement a statewide application. The effort included coordination and integration of CHARTS, the State Distribution Unit (Treasurer's State Payment Center), JUSTICE (the court information system) and Douglas County. CHARTS is used by the Child Support program to enforce child support orders and collect child support money for children. The state's Child Support collections have increased.

CHARTS Child Support Activities include:

- Location of Absent Parents
- Establishment of Paternity
- Establishment of Orders for Child Support and Medical Support
- Enforcement of Child/Medical Support
- Review and Modification of Court Orders
- Monitor Child Support Orders
- Collection and Distribution of Support Payments
- Interface with NFOCUS
- Interface with other state systems
- Interface with national systems
- Cooperation with Other States

The 2005 CHARTS work plan has been created. The work packages are subject to change if emergency issues arise.

FUNDING SUMMARY

CHARTS	Charts Budget			
	FY'04	FY '05	FY '06	FY '07
	Actual	Budget	Budget	Budget
Processor	2,135,880	\$ 2,159,325	\$ 2,159,325	\$ 2,159,325
DB2	1,594,969	1,769,048	1,945,952	2,140,547
Printing 1 part	196			
Tape Mounts	58,396	59,611	61,102	62,629
Job Setup	268,114	268,114	268,114	268,114
Disk Storage	709,244	762,438	819,620	881,092
Job Output	12,949	12,949	12,949	12,949
LAN/Device Fee	-			
Fixed Function Term Conn.	420	576	-	-
Direct SNA Comp. Conn.	-	-	-	-
Direct Access	-			

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-03
Page 2 of 4

Online Viewing	1,704	1,704	1,704	1,704
CICS	46,880	33,932	35,289	36,701
CICS Test	262	188	196	196
Printing 2 part	-			
Overlays/Page Print	27,057			
CMS-R22 Processor Prime	-	-	-	-
CMS-R22 Proc. Non-Prime	-	-	-	-
CMS-Local Printing 1part	-			
CMS-Tape Mounts	-	-	-	-
CMS-File Recovery	-	-	-	-
CMS-Disk Storage	26	26	26	26
CMS-Job Print	-			
Outbound E-Fax	-	-	-	-
Outbond Long Distance E-Fax	-	-	-	-
NT Application 2	-	-	-	-
Lotus Notes Apps Trans	18	44	44	44
Lotus Notes Storage	0	29	29	29
Accounting/Admin Support	9,600	12	12	12
Job Scheduler	210	210	210	210
Monthly Server Support	30,720	30,720	30,720	30,720
IT Support	-	-	-	-
Systems Prog/Senior	-	-	-	-
SWI Maintenance	-	-	-	-
AMC-Print Lines	-	-	-	-
IMS Training-Classes	-	-	-	-
IMS Training-Room Rental	-	-	-	-
Computer Paper/Ribbons/Misc	-	-	-	-
Software License (SAS)	-	-	-	-
Tape Cartridge	5	1	1	1
Vendor Software	-	-	-	-
Secure ID Card	65	1	1	1
Contract/Programmer/PCLan	-	-	-	-
Westlaw Mo. Software	-	-	-	-
Direct Software Cost	23,050	-	-	-
Misc.	8,993	8,993	8,993	8,993
Total	\$ 4,928,759	\$ 5,107,920	\$ 5,344,287	\$ 5,603,293
Staff Cost				
Contractors	\$ 4,535,994	\$ 4,947,452	\$ 4,969,018	\$ 4,969,018
FTE	\$ 1,452,085	\$ 2,774,983	\$ 2,785,575	\$ 2,785,575
Total Staff Cost	\$ 5,988,079	\$ 7,722,436	\$ 7,754,593	\$ 7,754,593
DCS	\$ 210,684	\$ 210,684	\$ 210,684	\$ 210,684
Sub Total	\$ 11,127,521	\$ 13,041,040	\$ 13,309,564	\$ 13,568,570

HHS Budget Cost (only)	\$ 1,639,679	\$ 2,693,373	\$ 2,693,373	\$ 2,693,373
IMService - IS & T Grand Total	\$ 16,025,827	\$ 15,734,413	\$ 16,002,937	\$ 16,261,943

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	10	13	13	12.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	16	15	23	18.0	25
V: Technical Impact	1	12	0	4.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	1	6	5	4.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	1	5	0	2.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	15	18	14.3	20
TOTAL				55	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good History of the CHARTS project - The list of objectives in Section III reflect a detailed plan of what will be accomplished. - The 2005 work plan is clear. It appears that several business and technical objectives have been effectively balanced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where is the description of the new project proposal we are to review?? This is a project request form not a report form. Lots of acronyms that make no sense to me. - The measurement and assessment section lists increased child support collections/disbursements as the only metric for verifying whether the project outcomes have been achieved. Although that is the primary purpose of the CHARTS application, other possible metrics would include efficiency of staff, accuracy, compliance with state and federal requirements, system performance, and system operating costs. - Less insight is provided for future years -- I assume the issues will be similar but the specific objectives will be based on current business needs at that time. I suggest the project consider using the Federal incentive metrics for assessing success since increased collections will likely occur with or without the planned enhancements.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The answer to question 4 lists six general benefits to justify \$16M in expenditures, no information is provided for question 5, and the information for question 6 implies that FSA88 and PRWORA mandate every aspect of the project. This section should indicate the relative benefits, type of benefits, and magnitude of effort for the proposed outcomes. How will the work be prioritized? What would be the consequences of not achieving some of the outcomes? What would be the consequences of reducing the ongoing level of support by \$1M or \$2M, for example? - Consider tangible monetary benefits related to federal performance bonuses
V: Technical Impact		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No answer - total loss of points - No information is provided for either questions 7 or 8. Very likely, none of the changes to the system will have a major technical impact, except

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-03
Page 4 of 4

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		for some of the performance improvements and new interfaces with DOL and other systems. If so, this should be stated, and any other issues in questions 7 and 8 should be addressed. - Not answered
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Excellent work plan. - Major milestones and timelines are addressed for fiscal years 05 and 06.	- There is no information regarding questions 9, 11, and 12. - Items 9, 11 and 12 are not addressed. Fiscal year 2007 is not included.
VII: Risk Assessment		- No answers - No information is provided for questions 13 and 14. - The items were not addressed.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- Very hard to make sense out of it. Seems awfully expensive - This appears to be the entire operational budget for the CHARTS application, rather than just the costs of the proposed enhancements. Estimated cost for each enhancement or group of enhancements would be more useful.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-04
Page 1 of 3

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	Computata		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

State of Nebraska Veterans' Homes are engaged in a data system conversion and maintenance agreement upgrade. The Veterans' homes will be converting from two existing systems, "Advanced Institutional Management Systems" (AIMS) and Computata, to a new release of Computata Software. The new Computata software offers improved functionality in the areas of Admissions, Discharges and Transfers (ADT/Census), Billing, Resident Funds, Accounts Receivable, General Ledger, Care Plans, Physician's Orders and MDS/User-defined Assessments. The Minimum Data Set (MDS) feature, which is crucial for a facility's success or failure in both PPS reimbursement and state or federal surveys, is of particular interest to the Veterans' homes.

FUNDING SUMMARY

ONE TIME CONTRACT COSTS	GIVH	NVH	WNVC	TFVH	CO	Upon Execution	Upon Delivery of Software	Upon Final Acceptance	Total
Financial Software Costs									
Exhibit A II.-A.: Software License Fee	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000		\$50,000	\$50,000		\$100,000
Exhibit A II.-A.: Custom Programming w/ Interfaces						\$15,600	\$15,600		\$31,200
Exhibit A II.-B: Oracle Conversion Fee									\$24,000
Exhibit A II.-C: Monthly Maintenance Patient Accounting									\$24,000
Exhibit A II.-D: Oracle License (\$295x283)	138	70	23	47	5				\$24,000
Exhibit A IV.- Electronic Laser Forms (8) license						\$2,800			\$2,800
Software On Site Installation (Financial Package)									
Exhibit B IV A: On Site Installation Assistance (22 days)	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$10,000		\$12,000		\$12,000
Exhibit B IV B: On Site File Server Installation (2 days per server)	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000		\$10,000		\$10,000
Exhibit B IV B: Visit Expenses for 5 people							\$5,000		\$5,000
Maintenance Upgrade to Windows Oracle									
Exhibit C CHC Software Conversion to Oracle	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00	\$0.00	\$14,000			\$14,000
Exhibit C Oracle Workstation Licenses (283x\$295.00)	\$40,710	\$20,650	\$6,785	\$13,865	\$1,475	\$83,485			\$83,485
Exhibit C MidRange Data Conversion to Oracle	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000		\$8,000			\$8,000
Exhibit C Custom Programming & Interfaces									
Exhibit C On Site Tech Services: Initial Data Conversion	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000		\$8,000			\$8,000
Exhibit C On Site Tech Services: Visit Expenses							\$5,000		\$5,000
Exhibit C On Site Clinical Training Services (4	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000		\$4,000			\$4,000

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-04
Page 2 of 3

session) Exhibit C On Site Clinical Services: Visit Expenses							\$5,000		\$5,000
Exhibit C On Site Financial Training Services	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000		\$16,000			\$16,000
Exhibit C On Site Financial Services: Visit Expenses							\$5,000		\$5,000
Exhibit C On Site Technical: Go-Live Conversion	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000		\$10,000			\$10,000
Exhibit C On Site Technical: Go-Live Visit Expenses							\$5,000		\$5,000
Total									\$348,485
Servers	1	1	1	1	1				\$75,000
Desktops 35 for GIVH and 14 for TFVH	\$38,500				\$15,400				\$53,900
Crystal Reports (2 copies)									\$5,200
Pharmacy Vendor Interface Program Cost									\$34,000
LC / CHT									\$20,000
AIMS Resident Data Conversion CSM / CHT									\$20,000
Total Additional Costs									\$188,100
Total Budget									\$536,585

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	14	10	12.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	21	15	16	17.3	25
V: Technical Impact	18	10	13	13.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	5	6	6.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	8	6	6	6.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	17	10	13	13.3	20
TOTAL				70	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Reduces 2 systems to 1. Success determined by external audit. - Including the information in the Executive Summary, this section is pretty explanatory.	- Connection to agency comprehensive IT plan not clear. - Not sure if measurement methods will verify project outcomes. Goals also refers to information not available in this proposal (exhibit d of contract).
IV: Project Justification / Business Case		- Tangible and intangible benefits not clear. - Very little information provided for any of these questions. #4 and #6 have the same answer and #5 does not have any strengths or weaknesses related to alternative solutions
V: Technical Impact	- Use of test server to work out issues before implementing into live systems.	- Nothing expressed about future growth / adaptation plans. - Answer to question #7 is the same as #1. - Answer to question #8 appears to be what should

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		have been included in #7. No discussion on present technology and no answers to the questions in #8
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training and implementation responsibilities are detailed. - Good description of project teams and training. Contract support information provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No timeline supplied. - No preliminary plan for implementing the project, no milestones/project plan identified. Ongoing support for servers, staff time and costs not identified.
VII: Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project appears to have support of several people in the agency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Risks / barriers poorly identified. - Not sure a lot of effort was put in to identifying the risks/barriers and their importance.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capital budget very detailed. - Good table of financial information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Operational budget not described. Oracle is a maintenance-intensive system. Is there expertise on staff? How much will the annual license fees be? Is there room in their operational budget for these ongoing costs? - Some columns do not add up correctly, no ongoing costs identified,

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-05
Page 1 of 4

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	MMIS (Medicaid Management Information System)		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

Note: Please see the Quarterly NITC Reports for full information on the planned release schedule and priorities established for the MMIS system. This report is an attempt to highlight some significant change requests.

- MMIS Procurement. Process all MMIS claims. The new system will provide enhanced claims processing functions, thereby increasing claims productivity and accuracy; greater client/user flexibility allowing program changes to be made more efficiently. Implement process allowing web healthcare transactions. It will also provide the tools to manage and distribute work, track and report all customer contacts, and provide a portal for providers and clients to obtain and share needed information with HHSS.
- Implement DSS/MRS/SURS. - Tracking and reporting process/storage to support health care data analysis services; provides software to develop a range of reporting and data analysis tools.
- Implement new HIPAA Regulations – NPI – National Provider Identification – federal regulation
- Managed Care ASO Vendor

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY'04	FY '05	FY '06	FY '07
MEDICAID	Actual	Budget	Budget	Budget
Processor	1,053,534	\$ 1,284,000	\$ 1,284,000	\$ 1,284,000
DB2	1,532	840	924	924
Printing 1 part	67,541			
Tape Mounts	151,065	165,000	169,125	173,353
Job Setup	155,939	165,000	165,000	165,000
Disk Storage	435,114	504,000	541,800	582,435
Job Output	23,731	34,800	34,800	34,800
LAN/Device Fee	-			
Fixed Function Term Conn.	5,148	4,896	-	-
Direct SNA Comp. Conn.	-	-	-	-
Direct Access	-			
Online Viewing	842	960	960	960
CICS	472,935	32,400	33,696	35,044
CICS Test	29,112	25,944	26,982	28,061
Printing 2 part	214			
Overlays/Page Print	22,781			
CMS-R22 Processor Prime	1	2	2	2
CMS-R22 Proc. Non-Prime	0	1	1	1
CMS-Local Printing 1part	-			
CMS-Tape Mounts	-	-	-	-

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-05
Page 2 of 4

CMS-File Recovery	-	-	-	-
CMS-Disk Storage	12	24	24	24
CMS-Job Print	-	-	-	-
Outbound E-Fax	-	-	-	-
Outbound Long Distance E-Fax	-	-	-	-
NT Application 2	-	-	-	-
Lotus Notes Apps Trans	1,627	2,400	2,400	2,400
Lotus Notes Storage	56	56	56	56
Accounting/Admin Support	-	-	-	-
Job Scheduler	441	1,800	1,800	1,800
Monthly Server Support	-	-	-	-
IT Support	-	-	-	-
Systems Prog/Senior	-	-	-	-
SWI Maintenance	-	-	-	-
AMC-Print Lines	-	-	-	-
IMS Training-Classes	-	-	-	-
IMS Training-Room Rental	-	-	-	-
Computer Paper/Ribbons/Misc	5	5	5	5
Software License (SAS)	-	-	-	-
Tape Cartridge	23	23	23	23
Vendor Software	-	-	-	-
Secure ID Card	65	65	65	65
Contract/Programmer/PCLan	-	-	-	-
Westlaw Mo. Software	-	-	-	-
Direct Software Cost	-	-	-	-
Misc.	4,967	4,967	4,967	4,967

Total	\$ 2,426,683	\$ 2,227,183	\$ 2,266,630	\$ 2,313,920
--------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Staff Cost				
Contractors	\$ 1,864,431	\$ 2,824,088	\$ 2,836,796	\$ 2,836,796
FTE	\$ 713,517	\$ 2,148,893	\$ 2,158,993	\$ 2,158,993
Total Staff Cost	\$ 2,577,947	\$ 4,972,980	\$ 4,995,789	\$ 4,995,789

DCS	\$ 210,684	\$ 210,684	\$ 210,684	\$ 210,684
------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Sub Total	\$ 5,215,314	\$ 7,410,847	\$ 7,473,103	\$ 7,520,393
------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

HHS Budget Cost (only)	\$ 116,303	\$ 275,000	\$ 275,000	\$ 275,000
IMService - IS & T Grand Total	\$ 5,331,617	\$ 7,685,847	\$ 7,748,103	\$ 7,795,393

Expansion budget			30,000,000	20,000,000
Final Budget	\$ 5,331,617	\$ 7,685,847	\$ 37,748,103	\$ 27,795,393

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	13	11	11.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	15	23	20	19.3	25
V: Technical Impact	12	13	18	14.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	7	8	7.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	0	0	0	0.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	13	18	18	16.3	20
TOTAL				69	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The goals and objectives assume that the reader is familiar with the problems of the existing MMIS. An explanation of those deficiencies would help provide an understanding of the goals. It is not clear that the outcome would be a complete replacement of the existing MMIS. The measurement and assessment methods are too abbreviated for the magnitude of the project. No information is provided for question 3. - The timeframe to achieve the objectives is not clear. Consider metrics that will illustrate the improvement in claims processed without intervention and the increase in the number of detected fraud cases.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current federal mandate (NPI) is identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The information in Section IV is not adequate to explain or justify a \$50M project. The answer to question 4 (project justification) should provide more detail and explanation of why the MMIS needs to be replaced. It should acknowledge that recent improvements to meet HIPAA requirements achieved the goal of avoiding possible penalties and lawsuits, but did not rectify the fundamental problems of an aging system. The answer to question 5 (other solutions) should provide an overview of the consultant's study and the four options that were evaluated. The answer to question 6 should explain the federal mandate, deadline, and problems with compliance. - Consider identifying tangible monetary benefits like reduced case processing costs and increased fraud recovery. - Item 3 - Assume that a new system does provide some efficiency, productivity, cost reductions/ratios, etc? ex - system expected to handle same volume at x% less cost?
V: Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some description of the approach is included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The information in section V is not adequate for a \$50M project. What are the hardware, software, and communications requirements -- or will these be determined after a solution is chosen through competitive bidding? Will the technology of the new system be superior to the existing MMIS and why? No information is provided for question 8 regarding the proposed technology. - Technical impact is not well described. - Technical requirements are missing. This may be

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		<p>a consequence of the current stage of the project's planning efforts. Item 8 is not addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Item 7 - Could be more effective and provide context if contrasted today's environment with proposed?
<p>VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The information is rather sketchy, even considering the project is still being defined. Regarding question 9, who is the project sponsor, and what approach will be used to insure stakeholder acceptance? Given the size of the project, will there be a formal project team and what project management methodology will be in place? Is there a need for outside assistance with vendor selection, contract negotiations, or independent verification and validation? - Most of the information is not available at this stage of the planning cycle. - Item 9 & 10 - Recognize no firm schedule, but perhaps could layout some hi-level timeline for major activities (ex - RPF Development, Solicitation, Selection, System Development, Implementation, etc..)
<p>VII: Risk Assessment</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No information is provided regarding risks or strategies to minimize risks. The magnitude of a project to replace the state's Medicaid Management Information System requires early and frequent attention to risks. This section should not be ignored, even considering the early stages of planning.
<p>VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Granted, this is in the early stages of planning, but what is the basis for the estimated \$50M in costs? No information is provided regarding the need for new FTE or ongoing operational costs. - CICS projection is likely \$300,000 understated - What is expansion budget in figures? Maybe add footnote about those costs given they're pretty significant?

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	N-FOCUS: Nebraska Family On Line Client User System		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Nebraska Family On Line Client User System (N-FOCUS) is an integrated eligibility, case management, benefit and service delivery system supporting major client service programs.

Note: Please see the Quarterly NITC Reports for full information on the planned release schedule and priorities established for the N-FOCUS system. This report is an attempt to highlight some significant change requests.

N-FOCUS is currently implementing 19 large projects plus other project level work areas:

1. A78 project completes the conversion of the Expert System software (AION) from version 7 to version 9.5. Remaining work and enhancements to the logic will be a large part of the Expert System work in the November 8, 2004 major release;
2. Web Enablement to determine the feasibility of meeting the business need to access N-FOCUS remotely;
3. Child Support Referral: A project level enhancement to the automated referral from N-FOCUS to the CHARTS system;
4. Behavioral Health: The decision has been made to incorporate the support community based mental health services into N-FOCUS functionality. A committee has reviewed many options available to HHSS based on compatibility and funding issues and N-FOCUS was the system of choice. This review was initiated due to the passage of LB1083;
5. Disaster Recovery;
6. Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA): Since N-FOCUS currently pays some medical claims and stores medical information such as diagnoses for state wards and developmental disability clients, it falls under HIPAA regulations (transaction and code sets, privacy and security);
7. Print Architecture (Phase Four) which creates a new and improved approach to creating and printing correspondence;
8. Reporting Architecture;
9. Foster Care Review Board (FCRB): A project level enhancement to add required functionality for the FCRB to N-FOCUS. This is due to a finding in the federal SACWIS review mandating that FCRB functionality be part of the SACWIS (N-FOCUS) system.;
10. Protection and Safety Reform Project: The P&S Division is considering significant changes to the Intake process for child welfare. If the decision is made to proceed, there would also mean significant changes to the system including Intake, Case Plan, Court Report, etc. Some of this individual work will end up being project level work in itself, such as a redesign of Court Report and Legal Actions.
11. SVES (State Verification Eligibility System) Internet Application: Technical staff continue to test the access control stored procedure. IMS staff is working on changes to the SDX (State Data Exchange – automated exchange with Social Security Administration) display. The goal is to have all SVES users off the CICS application and converted to the web application.
N-FOCUS Eligibility Summary windows: Enhancements are being made to these windows.
12. N-FOCUS Inquiry Internet Application: We would also like to obsolete the CICS inquiry application and convert all current users to the web application. IMS/DAS and N-FOCUS staff are coordinating this effort.;
13. HHSS Web Development: This is a technical research project involving all three major applications (MMIS, CHARTS and N-FOCUS). Research is ongoing on possible directions and overall architecture for HHSS web application development. A pilot has been chosen from the MMIS application.;

14. Performance Monitoring Review: A research effort within N-FOCUS to review how and why we capture performance information. This will include ensuring that solutions are implemented for previous CICS runaway task problems as well as current CICS usage reporting anomalies.;
15. Citrix and Expert System Compatibility: Although this effort will not be fully supported until post A78 implementation, technical research is in place with both N-FOCUS and IS&T staff to initiate some performance testing to determine how many users may be supported on a super sized Citrix server.;
16. Information Services Management has announced the elimination of their support to two automated systems: Impact Printing is scheduled for elimination on June 30, 2004 and the VM system is scheduled for elimination on June 30, 2005. N-FOCUS has several print jobs that use Impact Printing. Overall HHS, has many jobs still using the VM system. N-FOCUS staff is in the process of reprioritizing other work to make the necessary transitions.;
17. Adult Protective Services (APS): A project level enhancement to add functionality to fully support the APS program within N-FOCUS. The time frame on this project is pressed by the IMS elimination of support for the VM system on which their current system resides
18. State Ward Accounts: A project level enhancement to add transfer functionality for tracking state ward funds from the AIMS system to N-FOCUS. The decision to do this was based on two issues: this is a SACWIS requirement and the AIMS software is being converted to AVATAR software;
19. Supervisory Database: N-FOCUS staff were instrumental in setting up a Lotus Notes database to help SSW Supervisors track case reviews, errors, etc. in support of the project to reduce errors in the Food Stamp program area. N-FOCUS staff also helped establish a database for Employment First (EF) supervisory review. Analysis is in progress to incorporate this review functionality into N-FOCUS to avoid having data in multiple locations.

In addition, there are several other projects underway that do not have as widespread an impact but still involve significant work:

- 1) AFCARS/SACWIS: Annual APDU is required to support ongoing funding and gain certification.;
- 2) FICA: Ongoing annual work. Impact printing project will directly affect this functionality.;
- 3) LIS (Licensing Information System): N-FOCUS has work to support this project;
- 4) Purge/Archive/Retrieval
- 5) Training Viewlets: Redesign of how we build and maintain the N-FOCUS training image;
- 6) Robohelp: Researching moving this to a web application.;
- 7) XP Operating System; Office OX: IS&T initiative that will directly affect N-FOCUS. Initial staff research in progress.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY'04	FY '05	FY '06	FY '07
N-FOCUS	Actuals	Budget	Budget	Budget
Processor	1,238,691	\$ 1,248,421	\$ 1,248,421	\$ 1,248,421
DB2	4,202	4,763	5,239	5,239
Printing 1 part	6,287			
Tape Mounts	177,653	178,289	182,746	187,314
Job Setup	201,861	201,861	201,861	201,861
Disk Storage	411,767	442,649	475,848	511,537
Job Output	7,837	7,837	7,837	7,837
LAN/Device Fee	-			
Fixed Function Term Conn.	-			
Direct SNA Comp. Conn.	-	-	-	-
Direct Access	-			
Online Viewing	698	698	698	698

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-06
Page 3 of 5

CICS	3,132,204	2,760,000	2,870,400	2,985,216
CICS Test	20,643	14,931	15,528	16,149
Printing 2 part	-			
Overlays/Page Print	27,576			
CMS-R22 Processor Prime	-	-	-	-
CMS-R22 Proc. Non-Prime	-	-	-	-
CMS-Local Printing 1part	-			
CMS-Tape Mounts	-	-	-	-
CMS-File Recovery	-	-	-	-
CMS-Disk Storage	6	6	6	6
CMS-Job Print	-			
Outbound E-Fax	-	-	-	-
Outbound Long Distance E-Fax	-	-	-	-
NT Application 2	4,680	12	12	12
Lotus Notes Apps Trans	4,003	10,006	10,006	10,006
Lotus Notes Storage	214	268	268	268
Accounting/Admin Support	-	-	-	-
Job Scheduler	-	-	-	-
Monthly Server Support	-	-	-	-
IT Support	-	-	-	-
Systems Prog/Senior	-	-	-	-
SWI Maintenance	-	-	-	-
AMC-Print Lines	-	-	-	-
IMS Training-Classes	-	-	-	-
IMS Training-Room Rental	-	-	-	-
Computer Paper/Ribbons/Misc	-	-	-	-
Software License (SAS)	-	-	-	-
Tape Cartridge	9	2	2	2
Vendor Software	-	-	-	-
Secure ID Card	65	1	1	1
Contract/Programmer/PCLan	-	-	-	-
Westlaw Mo. Software	-	-	-	-
Direct Software Cost	237,526	-	-	-
Misc.	1,064	1,064	1,064	1,064

Total	\$ 5,476,986	\$ 4,870,808	\$ 5,019,938	\$ 5,175,632
Staff Cost				
Contractors	\$ 3,118,819	\$ 2,874,396	\$ 2,883,908	\$ 2,883,908
FTE	\$ 2,352,467	\$ 2,948,900	\$ 2,959,974	\$ 2,959,974
Total Staff Cost	\$ 5,471,286	\$ 5,823,295	\$ 5,843,882	\$ 5,843,882

DCS	\$ 210,684	\$ 210,684	\$ 210,684	\$ 210,684
------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Sub Total	\$ 11,158,956	\$ 10,904,788	\$ 11,074,504	\$ 11,230,198
------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

HHS Budget Cost (only)	\$	1,089,004	\$	1,223,141	\$	1,223,141	\$	1,223,141
IMService - IS & T Grand Total	\$	12,247,960	\$	12,127,929	\$	12,297,645	\$	12,453,339

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	8	13	13	11.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	10	22	23	18.3	25
V: Technical Impact	10	16	18	14.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	8	10	8.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	8	9	7.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	18	18	15.3	20
TOTAL				75	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- The 19 objectives are well documented.	- This is a catch all application. Perhaps they need up to 19 forms rather than one. Is it all or nothing? Each of the 19 need to be judged or prioritized, in my view. They do not describe the measurement of assessment methods to be used. No idea how this relates to their agency comprehensive plan. - Timeframes for delivery of the 19 objectives are unclear as are the relative priorities of the objectives. Consider metrics that measure program (business) outcomes. - A large project (or program?) hard to quantify in this document. Would it make more sense to focus on more of the immediate incremental steps instead of the broad spectrum of what's scoped?
IV: Project Justification / Business Case		- Did not answer the question - what other alternatives were considered. They list a lot of programs but which ones have which mandates? - Consider identifying specific monetary benefits such as reduced costs due to duplication of benefits or avoidance of federal penalties. Benefits are stated in general terms -- consider including specifics related to the Governor's initiatives such as behavioral health and child protection.
V: Technical Impact	- Scalability is addressed.	- So what? How does the requested project enhance or change what they currently have? #8 - If this is true, why are they requesting more \$ for upgrading? - Technical elements are not well described nor is conformity with standards. - Given system originally deployed in 1996, maybe add some more verbiage to better explain how system/architecture has evolved to leverage newer technologies over time?
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Several milestones are identified.	- Why are they asking for more \$ when they state this is all in production? - No milestones for calendar years 2006 and 2007 are identified.
VII: Risk	- Strong process for involving stakeholders to set	- They need to expand the "sound-bytes" to

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Assessment	priorities. - Steering Comm good idea to manage changing priorities/issues	answer the question. They need to rate their relative importance
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- For a 12 million dollar request, it is hard to approve based on the information provided. Very week document. Very hard to figure out the budget, to many unknowns. - If contractor costs that high through 2007 (at least as high as FTE), are there other options to minimize that requirement cost?

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	Computer Hardware & Software Renewal Policy and Program		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project proposes to replace one-fourth of the personal computers (PCs) and standard software packages in use by HHSS (Health and Human Services System) per year. HHSS operates approximately 5600 desktop PCs in 150 locations across the state. Many of these PCs are old and well past their warranty coverage. Use of old PCs and outdated software hinder job performance for the user. The PCs are slow, the user can only have one program open at a time, many software programs will not run and they experience continual problems causing downtime and requiring a technician to come on-site to repair.

This project supports the Agency’s staff and ultimate mission of helping people live better lives through **effective** health and human services. The availability of a reliable PC is essential to HHSS staff performing their job to serve the public of the State of Nebraska.

This is primarily a PC replacement plan and IS&T (Information Systems and Technology) Management would like to have the flexibility to use these funds to upgrade the standard applications as they become outdated or unsupported.

This project also supports the NITC (Nebraska Information Technology Commission) goal of developing a Technical Plan that recommends a technical infrastructure that will be scalable, reliable, and efficient.

FUNDING SUMMARY

Included in the continuation budget is \$1.5 million per year for Desktop upgrades.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	10	13	13	12.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	18	23	19	20.0	25
V: Technical Impact	17	16	17	16.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	9	8	9	8.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	8	8	8	8.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	16	16	14	15.3	20
TOTAL				81	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Very clear goals and objectives.	- A listing of historical metrics of PC trouble calls, upgrade problems and other measurements would strengthen the section on assessment methodology.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case		- If available, actual downtime statistics and the percent that stems from old PCs would help document the business case.
V: Technical Impact		

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation		
VII: Risk Assessment		
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- The budget requests \$1,500,000 to replace 25% of 5,600 desktops, or slightly more than \$1,000 per desktop. Is this amount consistent with current prices?

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-08
Page 1 of 3

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	Electronic Vital Records System	\$281,600.00	\$477,000.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Vital Records unit is charged with maintaining the official records for all birth, death, marriage, divorce, and fetal death events that occur in Nebraska. The new system will support the automation of on-line registration of events, use electronic signatures in issuance of vital records, provide standardization, integration of databases, efficient management and rapid responses to citizens, governmental agencies, businesses and others requesting vital event information. The proposed project is an upgrade to the current Vital Records system already in place.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Total
5. Training	\$ 69,000.00	\$ 22,800.00	\$ 36,000.00			\$ 127,800.00
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware	\$ 72,000.00	\$ 148,800.00	\$ 346,000.00			\$ 566,800.00
8.2 Software	\$ 975,300.00	\$ 110,000.00	\$ 95,000.00			\$ 1,180,300.00
TOTAL COSTS	\$ 1,116,300.00	\$ 281,600.00	\$ 477,000.00			\$ 1,874,900.00
Cash Funds	100%	100%	100%			
TOTAL FUNDS						

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	13	13	12.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	22	19	21	20.7	25
V: Technical Impact	15	14	16	15.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	9	6	7.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	7	5	8	6.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	13	14	15	14.0	20
TOTAL				76	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The goals are achievable and represent a benefit to both the agency and the public. - Clear statement of expected outcomes and assessment methods; identifiable/measurable benefits; benefits are widespread 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The assessment does not include any indication of user feedback to determine the impact of improvements. - A listing of the major functions and requirements of a "comprehensive information system" for vital records would provide a better understanding of the project. - Project appears to be driven in part by federal mandates, not always the best reason to do something but something that can't be ignored; without reviewing entire agency IT plan, it is difficult to assess how this project rates in the

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The review provides a succinct high-level list of the benefits of proceeding with this project. - Business process improvements are clearly identified; potential for increased federal reimbursement based on performance is a strong point. 	<p>overall agency plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The review does not include any detail as to the nature of the "shrink-wrapped" applications that were assessed nor does it provide insight as to the primary reason for the selected application. - How much money could be generated by improving the timeliness of data submitted to the Federal government? Is there a penalty for not complying with the federal mandate for reporting additional information in 2005? How much staff time and other costs will be saved by eliminating paper processes and having to scan documents? Will hospitals and other major users benefit by eliminating paper? - Federal mandate as a project driver is unfortunate but real; it appears that a sole-source contract may be anticipated, which must be done properly under state contracting procedures and is likely to be scrutinized if a bid process is not pursued.
V: Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative provides an indication that the solution is consistent with existing technology requiring no additional training for staff. - Improved performance for hospitals and others submitting data is stated, although not in great detail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative provides no indication of the scalability of the solution nor is security addressed. - Describe the technical elements of the project, including hardware, software, and communications requirements. What changes in technology are required. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed solution? Is the system customizable? - "Using a modem" to submit data implies lower network speed but does not indicate whether data must then be entered manually. Statement that data would be input directly implies that manual data entry currently exists, but this is not stated.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative provides a satisfactory overview of intent with some indication of how training will be provided. - Phasing the project with standalone deliverables is a good strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative provides no indication of how the intent to change will be disseminated in advance of the implementation date. Given the importance of buy-in by end users this would seem to be a significant oversight. - Apparently the solution has already been chosen, in order to meet the January 1, 2005 implementation date for Phase I. What is the solution? - Not clear how 1/1/05 milestone will be met, although it seems to be driven by federal mandate. Very difficult to assess how reasonable other time frames are with little technical information. Would appear to be very challenging.
VII: Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The narrative clearly indicates the basic mission critical task that must be performed and the need to limit the scope of the implementation given the timelines. - Accurately describes the greatest risk, since the project not only involves technical upgrades but also a vast amount of training. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No contingency plans are listed or suggested. - A project with this many aspects and stakeholders probably has a much longer list of risks. It is essential to identify risks and develop mitigation strategies. For example, what steps will be taken to insure cooperation of all of the stakeholders listed in Phases II, III, and IV? Are there any technical barriers to connecting these entities to the system?
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The provision of figures is satisfactory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The cost of the "system" is high based on the relative specificity of its scope. Without some indication of the alternatives such a cost is not easily justified. For example, are there web-based packages that could provide equal functionality without a premium in the way of Microsoft licensing? - What is the basis for the budget? Other than training, will there be any consulting costs for

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		customization of the system? - Very difficult to assess without details. And, if the federal government provides reimbursement based on performance, wouldn't there be some dollar amount allocated to federal funds?

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
HHSS	Network Technology Renewal Plan		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project addresses the Health and Human Services Systems (HHSS) IT Technology Plan goal of maintaining a stable, responsive, dependable and secure Wide Area and Local Area Network Infrastructure. The project includes the acquisition and installation of Routers, Switches and un-interruptible Power Supplies to replace obsolete equipment currently in operation or equipment reaching the end of its useful life.

This project supports the Agency's staff and ultimate mission of helping people live better lives through effective health and human services. The replacement of the network equipment across the HHSS supports intra-agency collaboration, communication, cooperation and security. The data network is the common information technology platform upon which staff can depend and one that enables them to securely connect to HHSS information technology resources across the state and with other public and private networks.

This project also supports the NITC (Nebraska Information Technology Commission) goal of aggregating demand, reducing acquisition and operational costs and creating support networks.

FUNDING SUMMARY

One-time cost to purchase 414 switches	\$414,000
Cost to purchase 325 UPS systems	\$162,500
Annual cost to lease routers	\$ 79,200
	\$655,700
	\$327,850 State funds
	\$327,850 Federal funds

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	13	14	13	13.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	22	22	21	21.7	25
V: Technical Impact	18	17	16	17.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	10	9	9.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	9	8	9.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	19	15	16	16.7	20
TOTAL				87	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear, concise goals are described that can be measured by specific timelines. - Proactive goal of replacing aging equipment, Project is included in the IT Plan. Power protection for those that don't have it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More detail on what equipment is projected to be replaced would help. Mean Time Before Failure information is not necessarily a factor in determining if a piece of equipment is obsolete. Actual failure rate information and cost to repair information would be more valuable.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #25-09
Page 2 of 2

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Describes a very critical infrastructure that needs 24x7 support. - Maintaining high availability is a requirement in today's business environment. HHSS listed the number sites that are active. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although they indicate that there is not alternative to upgrading the infrastructure components, they do not mention the alternative of leasing these components through a centralized organization. - Assume that there are 95 sites that will be upgraded over 2 years, but information on number of staff members and clients served by these sites would add "value".
V: Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Security is an important area and this project implies improvements in this area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no description of what types of reliability issues they are attempting to resolve. - Proposal could use more definition on what equipment is being proposed. There is not real definition of what the new equipment will be nor does it identify what is being replaced. Without this information, it is difficult to determine if proposed solution is feasible. What security features are being added?
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have a strong, realistic timeframe for replacement. - Preliminary timeline should be workable. All work performed by current staff (and possibly telephone company staff - leased router). 	
VII: Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good list of barriers and risks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Importance of barriers and risks not identified. For the most part, the barriers and risks are the same.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very realistic costs in budget. - Federal/State funding split is great. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Without more detail on what specific equipment is being acquired, it is impossible to determine if the funding is appropriate. This includes the purchased hardware as well as leased hardware. No discussion concerning annual maintenance on switches and UPS products.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	Nebraska Enterprise Centerline Transportation Attribute Resource (NECTAR)		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Nebraska Enterprise Centerline Transportation Attribute Resource (NECTAR) is an Intranet web-based Geographic Information Systems (GIS) decision-support tool developed by the NDOR Information Systems Division using web-mapping technology. It allows the user to query multiple databases containing road, bridge, railroad, average daily traffic (ADT) location, and a variety of other transportation data and map the results. Reports may also be generated using the data.

FUNDING SUMMARY

No financial information provided.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	7	14	10.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	15	12	24	17.0	25
V: Technical Impact	12	5	19	12.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	2	10	6.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	0	9	5.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	0	0	13	4.3	20
TOTAL				55	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Goals and objectives are valid - This project will greatly expand and broaden access to and the usability of the agency's GIS and associated data. By moving this system to a web-based application, it will greatly enhance individual (non-GIS expert) users access to and query of the agency's data. This is particularly important in terms of providing access to remote sites, such as the agency's District Offices. There is also growing interest within local governments to build on this proposed system to input and maintain local data related to local transportation systems and related infrastructure, which would in turn potentially make this local data available to state agencies and programs, such as Homeland Security and emergency response. Moving these systems to the web is an industry trend and a cost-effective technology trend that takes these applications out of a centralized office, with limited access, and makes them available to a much broader user community.	- No description of project other than the executive summary. No real answers to questions 2 and 3. Answer to question 9 implies this project is already complete. - The major weakness on this project proposal is will how the Project Proposal Form was completed, instead of the project itself. It would have been nice to have had a little more narrative information on how this project integrates with NDOR's comprehensive technology plan, however because I have set in on some of those discussions, I am comfortable with the level of coordination that is occurring.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- A major justification for this project is the degree to which it will greatly leverage the existing investments that NDOR has made in developing its GIS system. Moving it to a web-based application will allow many more users to access	- No other solutions were evaluated. Justification is weak considering the application is already complete, based on the answer to question 9.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	<p>the data and with the potential for local government use, it has the potential to provide a cost-effective means for local governments to collect and access this type of data, which will also make this local data available at the state level. Relative to exploring other solutions, I concur with the agency's assessment that since they are an Intergraph-based system, it makes sense to follow through with those integrated product applications. It is important to note that the data can be easily translated to other GIS systems.</p>	
<p>V: Technical Impact</p>	<p>- The software approach of this project is one that is mainstream and based on open-system technology. While the Intergraph GIS software used by NDOR is not a system that is widely used in Nebraska, it is a system that is well suited to NDOR engineering/GIS applications, and it is designed to provide easy, reliable import and export of data to open-GIS standards.</p>	<p>- No answer to question 8. Answer to 7 implies project is already implemented. Does not discuss hardware needs.</p>
<p>VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation</p>	<p>- Project is already implemented. - As noted in the project proposal, much work has already occurred in implementing this basic project. Now that the results of this pilot effort are available to be seen, there is growing interest in building on additional applications, both within the agency and with local governments. I believe there is adequate support available both from within the agency and from developers for this general approach and product.</p>	<p>- Project is already implemented. Why submit project proposal for a project that is already complete. If it is for enhancements, then no enhancements were identified.</p>
<p>VII: Risk Assessment</p>	<p>- The software upon which this project is based has a considerable longevity, reliability, and support both within the agency and external to NDOR. While the movement to the web is relatively new, there is a considerable level of expertise with NDOR related to the software upon which this project is based.</p>	<p>- No evaluation completed. - There are two potential area of risk with this project that occur to me. One area is how they will move this system from an internal agency-only access to the system to allow external access. The other potential risk is the fact that NDOR is an Intergraph shop and most other users in Nebraska are ESRI-based, including local governments. However, even those these concerns were not mentioned in the project proposal, I believe that the agency is aware of them and is proceeding at a deliberate pace to work through these potential areas of concern.</p>
<p>VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget</p>		<p>- No answers to these questions. - Apparently no budget or financial analysis information provided</p>

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	Document Management System		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

NDOR creates and receives thousands of documents from multiple sources every day. Currently our users and/or application system managers are responsible for filing and maintaining those documents in individual files. There is not central repository for them. That creates obvious difficulties in providing uniform rules for version and audit control and creates extra work for employees when they have to go through a sometimes lengthy process to locate a document they need and facilitate point-to-point or point-to-many dissemination of copies.

With a Document Management System (DMS) we will be able to centralize our business approach and business rules for document control, security, version control, access and dissemination. A DMS will provide one-stop-shop capability for our internal and external customers and allow us greater flexibility in improving our document business process.

FUNDING SUMMARY

No financial information provided.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	13	15	13.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	15	16	16	15.7	25
V: Technical Impact	0	0	0	0.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	0	0	0	0.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	0	0	0	0.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	0	0	0	0.0	20
TOTAL				29	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Goals are clear. - Good description of goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Metrics are too generally stated to allow a judgment about the project's success. Consider a sampling approach to determine the impact on productivity. You might also try to quantify the impact of lost or misplaced documents -- have there been legal or financial consequences with the current paper system?
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intangible benefits provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not much information is provided to justify the project. - The proposal does not describe tangible benefits. The intangible benefits are simply stated and are not well developed. "Doing nothing" is not discussed.
V: Technical Impact		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project proposal provides no information.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project proposal provides no information.
VII: Risk		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project proposal provides no information.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Assessment VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- The project proposal provides no information.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	Enterprise Asset Management System		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The Enterprise Asset Management System (EAMS) will provide a predictive maintenance process and work order management capability for three critical areas of NDOR operation—facilities, equipment and linear assets (road). The system will help forecast material, labor and equipment requirements for warranty and post-warranty repair or service in all three areas.

Deployed statewide in over 200 locations, EAMS will leverage a thin (web) client configuration and internet/intranet connectivity.

FUNDING SUMMARY

No financial information provided.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	13	15	13.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	24	16	25	21.7	25
V: Technical Impact	18	13	20	17.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	6	5	7	6.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	9	10	10	9.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	0	0	0	0.0	20
TOTAL				68	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Migration from manual to automated processes. - Executive summary includes description of project. Goals appear legitimate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No details on what sort of systems might be purchased (hardware, software, consultation, integration)
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specific, reasonable benefits. - Strong justification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solution has not been selected, so project proposal is weak in many answers.
V: Technical Impact		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical impact of project is hard to define when solution has not been selected. Most answers indicate that the selected solution will take in to account the issues mentioned in this section, but in reality, it is hard to prove that.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sponsors identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information listed as dependent on final selection. Should have stated what will be required of a successful bidder. - Most questions can not be answered at this time. No project solution has been selected. - Many requirements not yet available.
VII: Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good list of risks identified. 	
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No budget of any kind was supplied. How much is requested and how will it be spent?

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	Financial System Update		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This is an umbrella project for upgrades to the DOR Finance system to allow exporting financial data to the Nebraska Information System (NIS). The project requires some modification and upgrading of NDOR's mainframe finance system.

FUNDING SUMMARY

"Technology options for this project are still being researched. Until we understand exactly what combinations of software and hardware will be used we will not be able to adequately estimate either infrastructure or resource expenditures."

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	11	10	12.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	20	12	15	15.7	25
V: Technical Impact	18	10	16	14.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	9	9	9.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	8	7	8.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	0	5	5	3.3	20
TOTAL				63	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Well written and fully explained	- Outcomes and metrics are somewhat general - It is hard to evaluate this section, since the magnitude of the project is not known.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case		- Could have described the custom application characteristics better - No discussion of tangible benefits such as cost avoidance or expected productivity gains. Intangible benefits are general. Analysis of "do nothing" alternative is not included. Could NIS be an alternative? - What are the specific benefits stemming from this project? Can NIS provide some of the functionality? It is hard to evaluate this section, since the magnitude of the project is not known.
V: Technical Impact	- Seem confident the upgrade will work and meet their technical requirements	- Don't know yet what platform the FSU would be running on - Technical elements are not stated.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Well done - There appears to be a good project management structure in place.	- The timeline has not yet been established.
VII: Risk Assessment	- OK	- Only mainframe technology risks are addressed.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- No budget is supplied.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	NIS - Procurement/DOR Financials and Procurement Interface		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The NDOR NIS procurement Interface Project is a two way interface between the NDOR Financial Systems and the NIS Procurement application. Transactions must flow both directions as these systems share information.

FUNDING SUMMARY

The Contract for People Soft work is approximately \$150,000
DOR staff expenses will probably exceed \$750,000

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	13	12	13.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	23	10	10	14.3	25
V: Technical Impact	18	15	13	15.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	10	8	9.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	9	6	8.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	17	13	13.3	20
TOTAL				74	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Well done, although there seems to be an undercurrent of distrust between DOR and NIS - Specific goals are well identified.	- Does not describe assessments or measures of success
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Well done, although there seems to be an undercurrent of distrust between DOR and NIS	- No justification is provided. Is using the NIS system to feed the NDOR cost accounting system a viable alternative? - This section should summarize other potential solutions, including why NIS apparently cannot provide the functionality that DOR requires.
V: Technical Impact	- Interface format is proven and stable, as are the two applications.	- Turf war - does some discussion regarding philosophies need to happen between these agencies? NDOR and NIS team communication improvement?
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Hopefully Peoplesoft does deliver as promised! - All areas are addressed - A good project management structure appears to be in place.	- The timeline indicates the project will be complete by March 31, 2005, which is in the current fiscal year. If this is correct, should the project be included in the biennial budget request?
VII: Risk Assessment	- \$150,000 charge by Peoplesoft seems reasonable to risk - PeopleSoft has provided design information to reduce the risk.	- Some discussion about the challenges of keeping data in synch between the two systems would be helpful. - What are the resource requirements for NIS, and has NIS included this project in their schedule?
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- The implementation costs are specified.	- It is likely that ongoing support costs will be incurred as PeopleSoft issues new releases of their software.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		- Some documentation to support the estimated costs would improve the financial analysis.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	PioneerNET		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

In order to realize the full benefits of Nebraska's Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), an integrated software that actively monitors current (and future) field devices is required. The PioneerNET system software will meet those needs unlike commercial, off-the-shelf systems that offer only limited integration and do not provide the necessary flexibility for future changes. Our current systems are not integrated and the software provided by the manufacturers forces redundant entry and multiple programs to manage the system. ITS devices save time, money and lives by reducing delay on the freeway system, improving response and clearance of incidents, as well as reduction in secondary crashes. PioneerNET will be the software package managing the various components which provide functionality to each of the District Operation Centers (DOC).

PioneerNET will be consistent with National Transportation Communication for ITS Protocol (NTCIP) and NITC guidelines and is expected to have positive Benefit/Cost (B/C) Ratios. The system will include video servers, software servers, databases, and archive management servers located in each District. Without PioneerNET, NDOR will struggle to actively manage the freeway system which will result in additional delay and safety issues to the motoring public.

The financial budget is outlined in the Highway Program and the STIP and consists of three projects:

1. Functional Design of the Software
2. System Manager/Integrator
3. Software Development and Implementation

FUNDING SUMMARY

The financial budget is outlined in the Highway Program and the STIP and consists of three projects:

1. Functional Design of the Software
2. System Manager/Integrator
3. Software Development and Implementation

ITSN(2) - 2	ITSN(2) - 001	Statewide & FMS Final Design		
ITSN(2) - 3a		FMS Planning / Preliminary Engineering Study	\$	250,000
ITSN(2) - 3b		Omaha FMS Design	\$	400,000
ITSN(2) - 2d		Statewide ITS Element Design / PS & E	\$	500,000
ITSN(2) - 2a		Statewide (DOC) Design/Software Functional Design (2000-E1: RFP)	\$	900,000
ITSN(2) - 3c		Omaha FMS Software Functional Design	\$	250,000
	ITSN(2) - 003	System Manager		
ITSN(2) - 2c		Statewide Software System Manager	\$	600,000
ITSN(2) - 3e		Omaha FMS Software / Systems Manager	\$	350,000
	ITSN(2) - 004	Software Development/Implementation		
ITSN(2) - 2b		Statewide Software Development/Implementation	\$	1,250,000
ITSN(2) - 3d		Omaha/D-2 Software Development and Implementation	\$	750,000
ITSN(2) - 3f		Hardware / Video Design	\$	200,000

The Hardware and software will be determined during the first project listed above. New FTE's are not required to develop the software, but ultimately are needed to operate the ITS system. Initial discussions have considered contract staff to operate the system.

Currently, TTG is programming \$500,000 annually for system maintenance and enhancements.

State Funds are used to match (50/50) the Federal Dollars of an ITS Deployment Grant.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	15	13	13.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	15	22	22	19.7	25
V: Technical Impact	13	19	19	17.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	8	9	8.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	5	10	9	8.0	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	14	19	14	15.7	20
TOTAL				82	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly defined benefits and integration. - Examples good for understanding scope. 	
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - B/C ratios useful (if undocumented or explained). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Another option that should be evaluated is whether it is more cost effective to have a central operations center rather than creating duplicative capabilities in each district office. What are the advantages and disadvantages of locating "video servers, software servers, databases and archive management servers" in each district office? How will data, information and decisions be integrated among district offices? - COTS solutions described as inadequate. The system proposed will be largely a custom system (i.e. one of a kind and proprietary). This means long-time operational costs will be higher and warranty help is more likely to be problematic.
V: Technical Impact		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No explanation of why COTS systems are not appropriate.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project proposal identifies stakeholders and provides an overall timeframe. - Builds on an existing/ongoing project and requirement development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project team is not identified, and there is no detail regarding the type of training that will be needed.
VII: Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The barriers/risks stated were those typical of a custom application. There was good thought as to how to minimize the impact of those issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is a \$5.5 million project that has a significant chance for scope creep and cost overruns, based on experience in other states. An additional strategy for mitigating this risk is to implement rigorous project management methods. - The barriers/risks stated were those typical of a custom application. These risks would be lessened by a less custom system, though other risks are then introduced.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 50% federal match. - Project broken into phases. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The financial analysis does not provide much detail about on-going operational costs, including the additional positions necessary to support the

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		system. - The budget seems large, though probably correct for development of a system. - Unclear on how amounts were reached (hourly, etc). Unclear on what will be state and/or federally funded. Very difficult to estimate development costs before requirements are completed.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Department of Roads	Project Scheduling & Program Management System		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

To replace the existing 30 year old mainframe Project Scheduling System with new windows based Project Scheduling and Project Management System and to improve communication and overall time management, efficiency and timeliness of roadway projects to better serve the public.

FUNDING SUMMARY

"Cannot accurately determine, very early in the process we have not developed an RFI or RFP yet."

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	15	13	13	13.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	25	25	24	24.7	25
V: Technical Impact	10	18	16	14.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	8	8	8.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	8	8	8.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	0	13	7.7	20
			TOTAL	78	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Well done. Good job in describing the issue and their goal to fix the aging systems	
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Well done, explained nicely to make their case - Shifting from mainframe environment to server/web environment.	
V: Technical Impact		- Not to the point yet to make a good assessment of this impact - Would be helpful to know what sorts of general questions/requirements would be included in the RFI/RFP to better understand what the finished product will provide.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- Seem to have thought this through and have a good plan	
VII: Risk Assessment	- Seems like they need to do something as anything is better than the current situation	
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		- No budget estimates provided - No budget provided. States "cannot be accurately determined," but at least a list of probable expense categories would have been helpful. I have no idea how much they intend to ask for.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #37-01
Page 1 of 2

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Vocational Rehabilitation		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will procure, develop, install, and support Court Re-Engineering enhancements in the Vocational Rehabilitation section of the court. This will be based upon the results from current internal re-engineering analysis and the recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006. From the current internal analysis and court priorities, the first software products to be introduced to the court will be from one or more of the Key Technologies currently identified in the internal analysis that cannot be achieved with existing resources. This project will also provide the court with programming specific contract programmer(s) to work during development phases.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Future	Total
2. Contractual Services						
2.2 Programming	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 52,500.00	\$ 55,125.00	\$ 57,881.25	\$ 60,775.31	\$ 276,281.56
2.4 Other	\$ 2,900.00	\$ 3,190.00	\$ 3,349.50	\$ 3,516.98	\$ 3,692.82	\$ 16,649.30
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.2 Software	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 690.00	\$ 793.50	\$ 912.53	\$ 5,996.03
TOTAL COSTS	\$ 55,900.00	\$ 56,290.00	\$ 59,164.50	\$ 62,191.73	\$ 65,380.66	\$ 298,926.88
Cash Funds	\$ 55,900.00	\$ 56,290.00	\$ 59,164.50	\$ 62,191.73	\$ 65,380.66	\$ 298,926.88
TOTAL FUNDS	\$ 55,900.00	\$ 56,290.00	\$ 59,164.50	\$ 62,191.73	\$ 65,380.66	\$ 298,926.88

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	11	12	11.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	18	16	18	17.3	25
V: Technical Impact	18	13	18	16.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	6	8	7.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	6	7	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	18	12	17	15.7	20
TOTAL				74	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Project is tied directly and tightly to comprehensive technology plan - This proposal describes technologies to be adopted in support of the Worker's Compensation Court's strategic plan. The specific project seeks to implement document creation, storage, retrieval within the court, and the subsequent transfer of documents to participants in the case.	- Likely because this project will be based on results of internal analysis and consultant recommendations (to be completed at a later date), specific goals, outcomes, measurements and assessments are unclear.

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good statement of benefits - The two components of the project, enhanced e-files and message management, are necessary to meet the court's strategic plan of a paperless court. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assume final statement on page 4 should be "will NOT achieve" - As described in the commentary, prior requests for document management were turned down by the legislature. The proposal makes no mention of any hardware requirements necessary to support the storage of the documents created within the system. The proposal is for a system that will stand alone within the IT systems of the Worker's Compensation Court. Since alternatives exist for both storage and messaging systems, the benefit analysis should include a comparison of the cost for an internal system when compared to IMS alternatives for both storage and message management.
V: Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The key technologies have been tested within the operational environment of the Worker's Compensation Court. These "proof-of-concept" tests greatly reduce the possibility of failure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Third party word processing solution seems to be moving to more "closed" rather than open architecture. - From the dialog, the reviewer must assume that existing hardware and operating software are sufficient to meet the needs of the expanded capabilities contemplated in the proposal.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project staff and key components of the project are listed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IT staffing on project may be too light. Internal analysis and consultant recommendations are pending, so plan contains little detail. - The proposal contemplates an in-house developed solution, but the narrative only addresses implementation of message management, and message management deliver. Key milestones leading to implementation are not discussed.
VII: Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project narrative indicates that "proof-of-concept" testing has been completed. This will substantially reduce the risk associated with the project. If the technology is secure, the management of business implementation is correctly identified as the risk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project relies on results of "recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006". There appears to be a risk that the consultant engagement either is not funded, or is unsuccessful...either would impact this project. - Electronic document creation is listed as the first year project, while delivery of these documents is scheduled for the second year. This means that the court will continue to rely on the delivery of paper documents in the first year. Since messaging technology is available, perhaps the court should include electronic messaging in the first year of implementation.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acquisition, custom programming, and hosting fees are listed in the budget. Reviewers must assume that software licensing fees are correctly stated, and that programming fees are within the range of services necessary to achieve the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would expect hardware requirements in a project of this nature. This project probably needs at least part-time project management resources assigned. - This reviewer believes that electronic storage, enhanced backup procedures and hardware, and messaging components may add additional costs not reflected in the budget form.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #37-02
Page 1 of 3

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Coverage and Claims		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will procure, develop, install, and support Court Re-Engineering enhancements in the Coverage and Claims section of the court. This will be based upon the results from current internal re-engineering analysis and the recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006. From the current internal analysis and court priorities, the first hardware / software products to be introduced to the court will be from one or more of the Key Technologies currently identified in the internal analysis that cannot be achieved with existing resources.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Future	Total
7. Other Operating Costs	\$4,250	\$ 4,462.50	\$ 4,685.63	\$ 5,165.90	\$ 5,424.20	\$ 23,988.22
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware	\$51,500	\$ 1,545.00	\$ 1,622.25	\$ 1,703.36	\$ 59,617.69	\$ 115,988.30
8.2 Software	\$2,500	\$ 500.00	\$ 525.00	\$ 578.81	\$ 607.75	\$ 4,711.56
TOTAL COSTS	\$ 58,250.00	\$ 6,507.50	\$ 6,832.88	\$ 7,448.07	\$ 65,649.64	\$ 144,688.08
Cash Funds	\$ 58,250.00	\$ 6,507.50	\$ 6,832.88	\$ 7,448.07	\$ 65,649.64	\$ 144,688.08
TOTAL FUNDS	\$ 58,250.00	\$ 6,507.50	\$ 6,832.88	\$ 7,448.07	\$ 65,649.64	\$ 144,688.08

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	11	11	12.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	23	18	15	18.7	25
V: Technical Impact	18	13	13	14.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	5	5	6.0	10
VII: Risk Assessment	7	6	6	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	17	13	13	14.3	20
TOTAL				72	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very strong outline of goals, beneficiaries, and method to verify that the project outcomes have been achieved. - Project is tied directly and tightly to comprehensive technology plan - Project describes two additional components of the Worker's Compensation Court strategic plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Likely because this project will be based on results of internal analysis and consultant recommendations (to be completed at a later date), specific goals, outcomes, measurements and assessments are unclear. - The project contemplates an in-house solution that may duplicate services already provided within DAS. The court should consider outsourcing print management to the DAS print shop. Message management should be developed in conjunction with the messaging systems contemplated in the Vocational

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good case as to why things are not working as they are. Not sure there is a strong business case on what direction this is headed. No return on investment analysis. - This project contemplates automating paper correspondence. A reviewer must assume that this correspondence is currently being handled by staff. Justification, then, would be to allow staff to process either additional paper, or reduce staff time devoted to paper processing. 	<p>Rehabilitation proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not clear if consideration has been given to using centralized (Print Shop) printing/inserting service alternative - The Worker's Compensation Court plans to implement electronic messaging as a primary component of the court's business. While the court produces paper today, one must assume that the use of paper will decline over time as electronic messaging is accepted by filers. Since paper cannot be totally eliminated, improving staff ability to process paper communications is a proper goal. However, this request has the court purchasing equipment and operating that equipment within the court. As electronic messaging becomes accepted, the demand for this equipment should diminish. The court should contemplate outsourcing this service rather than purchasing equipment to provide it.
V: Technical Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good to hear the desire to work with IMS and DOC on compatibility. Also need to include other agencies that may have opportunities to partner in this venture. - Both telephonic response and enhanced print and mail management can function to make staff more efficient. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unclear how this interfaces with existing technology - Future costs of this technology is not clear. Staff resources are devoted to care and maintenance of print and mail management. Descriptions of telephonic response technology is vague. There is insufficient cost/benefit detail to allow this reviewer to make a recommendation on the technology.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would have like specific information on where and how the staff will be training on the Telephonic Response. Voice is a specialized technology that the agency may need some assistance with. - Internal analysis and consultant recommendations are pending, so plan contains little detail. - Milestone and deliverables are not defined beyond the technology to be implemented. Given the priority of contact management in 2006, with print management in 2007, one must conclude that telephonic response represents the greatest benefit to court. The current mail functions would continue. By 2007, the court may find electronic filing may negate the need for mail management equipment.
VII: Risk Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal identifies potential risks for the projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other risks include items such as complexity of system outpaces staff knowledge, technology changes, and costs of systems not being able to be sustained. - Project relies on results of "recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006". There appears to be a risk that the consultant engagement either is not funded, or is unsuccessful...either would impact this project. - Given known volumes of paper production, one would assume that the demands on the system are predictable. The risk assessment leaves open the possibility of future costs to support or modify the system.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Costs associated with the project are reasonable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Costs seem low, project likely would require interfaces or, at minimum, changes to legacy systems. - Hardware costs are listed one year before project is scheduled. No personnel or programming costs are associated with the project. This would presume that the solution is

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		turnkey. Hardware purchase may duplicate services already available.

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #37-03
Page 1 of 3

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Workers' Compensation Court	Court Re-engineering - Adjudication		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project will procure, develop, install, and support Court Re-Engineering enhancements in the Adjudication section of the court. This will be based upon the results from current internal re-engineering analysis and the recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006. From the current internal analysis and court priorities, the first software products to be introduced to the court will be from one or more of the Key Technologies currently identified in the internal analysis that cannot be achieved with existing resources.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Future	Total
2. Contractual Services						
2.4 Other		\$ 100,000.00				\$ 100,000.00
5. Training		\$ 36,382.50				\$ 36,382.50
6. Travel		\$ 12,127.50				\$ 12,127.50
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware		\$ 30,000.00			\$ 20,000.00	\$ 50,000.00
8.2 Software		\$ 355,556.25	\$ 103,607.44	\$ 108,787.81	\$ 109,790.00	\$ 677,741.50
TOTAL COSTS	\$ -	\$ 534,066.25	\$ 103,607.44	\$ 108,787.81	\$ 129,790.00	\$ 876,251.50
Cash Funds		\$ 534,066.25	\$ 103,607.44	\$ 108,787.81	\$ 129,790.00	\$ 876,251.50
TOTAL FUNDS		\$ 534,066.25	\$ 103,607.44	\$ 108,787.81	\$ 129,790.00	\$ 876,251.50

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	10	10	10.7	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	16	15	17	16.0	25
V: Technical Impact	17	14	14	15.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	8	5	7	6.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	8	5	6	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	15	12	15	14.0	20
TOTAL				69	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The primary outcome of the project appears to be a strategic plan for improving the workflow of the Court and its external stakeholders. The Agency Comprehensive IT Plan has an excellent discussion of the Court's overall strategy. - Project is tied directly and tightly to comprehensive technology plan - Workflow is one method used to make 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some of the outcomes should address business process improvements, with corresponding metrics. - Likely because this project will be based on results of internal analysis and consultant recommendations (to be completed at a later date), specific goals, outcomes, measurements and assessments are unclear.

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	<p>computing systems more efficient. This proposal contemplates the adoption of workflow technology into the adjudication system of the Worker's Compensation court.</p>	<p>- This reviewer is having a difficult time finding enough specificity in the proposal to make a recommendation on the merits of the proposal. The goals are listed as Process Management OR Adjudication System Replacement.</p>
<p>IV: Project Justification / Business Case</p>	<p>- Workflow is a key technology that can improve a computing system's ability to perform. To be effective, it should be used to support the business objectives of the court. The presumption is that the backend systems will remain in place.</p>	<p>- The business case would be much stronger if Section IV included specific information about existing problems that would be improved. The information for question 5 cites increased staffing, data quality, and a backlog. An explanation of these or other problems with supporting data would be helpful. In other words, what is wrong with doing things as they are today? - No other potential solutions identified - The lack of specificity of the project hinders this reviewer's ability to make a evaluation or recommendation.</p>
<p>V: Technical Impact</p>	<p>- Workflow would maintain the existing back-end systems.</p>	<p>- There should be more discussion of web-based options, especially given the implied objective of serving external stakeholders (question 1). Although the project proposal makes a good case that the functions of the Workers' Compensation Court are unique, there should be some discussion of how the underlying technology, especially workflow, and electronic filing relate to other systems purchased or developed by the state. - Specificity limits this reviewer's ability to comment on the impact of the project. Integration of workflow within the existing business process will have a different impact than integrating workflow AND replacing the adjudication system.</p>
<p>VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation</p>	<p>- The project proposal identifies the project team. - The workflow design team is well qualified to examine the business processes to be incorporated into the workflow product.</p>	<p>- I don't understand the information in the table in question 9. The recommendations of the consultant should be added to the list of milestones in question 10. - Timeline seems overly optimistic. IT staffing on project may be too light. Internal analysis and consultant recommendations are pending, so plan contains little detail. - The implementation plan calls for the procurement of a workflow product in the first year, with business engineering following. A better implementation plan might be to evaluate the workflow, the role of web-services, and the evaluation of new business processes developed as a result of the analysis before the workflow product is purchased. This approach might allow the court the opportunity to evaluate or replace the adjudication system without incurring workflow software costs.</p>
<p>VII: Risk Assessment</p>	<p>- A good start to listing potential risks. - The introduction of workflow will have both intended and unintended consequences on the court's computing systems. These risks are identified.</p>	<p>- Some other possible risks might include: rejection by external stakeholders and dependence on the software provider for support, functionality and future licensing costs, if a third party Adjudication Replacement System is chosen. (Are there any lessons learned from implementing NIS that are relevant here?) - Project relies on results of "recommendation from a consultant to be engaged in Fiscal Year 2006". There appears to be a risk that the consultant engagement either is not funded, or is unsuccessful...either would impact this project. - Unintended risk could be better managed by completing workflow analysis independent of the software purchased to support the workflow. This</p>

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		could result in a wiser purchasing decision. It may also result in a recommendation to use existing workflow products rather than the purchase of additional workflow products specifically for the courts.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- This reviewer presumes that the hardware/software costs are accurate.	<p>- Some explanation of how the estimated costs were determined would be helpful. How does one know that \$355,556 is even the correct order of magnitude for either a workflow application or an Adjudication Application? Is \$100,000 adequate for assistance with implementation? Also, the cost of the consultant's study in FY2006 should be reflected in the analysis.</p> <p>- This is a large project - probably needs project management resources. Budget seems to be built on an assumption of software purchase, but narrative suggests that COTS software is likely not a viable solution. Software maintenance costs seem high.</p> <p>- The possibility of replacing the adjudication system is not reflected in the cost of the project. Project costs are listed as hardware/software/training for the workflow product. The court should review the possibility of using existing workflow software products rather than developing their own.</p>

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #51-01
Page 1 of 2

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
University of Nebraska	University Enterprise Server Upgrade		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The University of Nebraska operates an IBM S/390 enterprise server to support our primary administrative business applications. The Enterprise Server supports applications including the Student Information System (SIS+) for UN-L and UNO, Enterprise Resource Planning (SAP), and the PSL/Budget (PSL) systems. Tivoli Storage Manager (TSM) uses an Automatic Tape Library for desktop and server backups and restores. Each of these products/services is continuing to grow as new features and end-users are added to these systems.

The current system is an IBM Z800 with two general purpose engines and two Linux engines. The two general purpose engines are used to support the administrative applications. They provide approximately 350 million instructions per second (mips) or 60 million service units (msu's). The system frequently runs at 100% capacity on this processor and there are times when the daily work load is not completed.

The purpose of this project is to add a new enterprise server to increase the number of processor cycles available in order to complete the ever increasing work load from SIS, SAP, and TSM. Along with the new processor, there will be an increase in software licensing costs.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY2005-06 (Year 1)	FY2006-07 (Year 2)	FY2007-08 (Year 3)	FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Future	Total
8. Capital Expenditures						
8.1 Hardware	\$ 350,000.00	\$ 325,000.00	\$ 300,000.00	\$ 275,000.00		\$ 1,250,000.00
8.2 Software	\$ 575,000.00	\$ 600,000.00	\$ 625,000.00	\$ 650,000.00		\$ 2,450,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ -	\$ 3,700,000.00
General Funds	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00		\$ 3,700,000.00
TOTAL FUNDS	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ 925,000.00	\$ -	\$ 3,700,000.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	14	15	13	14.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	23	23	19	21.7	25
V: Technical Impact	19	20	19	19.3	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	10	10	9	9.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	10	9	9	9.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	20	19	14	17.7	20
TOTAL				92	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and	- The narrative provides a comprehensive overview of the need for the project to move	- The narrative does not provide any indication of the likely life-cycle of this upgrade. That is,

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet
Biennial Budget FY2005-2007

Project #51-01
Page 2 of 2

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
Projected Outcomes	forward.	growth is expected but at what rate and how quickly is additional hardware likely to be required?
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- The narrative provides a good overview of the process whereby need was assessed and some of the alternatives.	- The narrative does not provide a very thorough overview of the options that were considered beyond doing nothing. For example, what alternative platforms were considered? - The justification would be strengthened by providing more detail. What types of transactions are impacted, and what are the consequences?
V: Technical Impact	- The narrative provides complete information to support the acquisition of the proposed hardware/software.	- The narrative raises the question of why processor upgrades are available for this model while not being an option for the current hardware.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- The narrative is clear and concise in this section and the proposed timelines are reasonable.	
VII: Risk Assessment	- The listed risks and management of them is clear and reasonable.	
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Costs are broken out and consistent with the scope of the project.	- The timeframe (question 9, Section VI) indicates that the project will be completed by December 2005 (FY06). The budget shows 25% of the costs in FY06 and the balance spread out over the following 3 fiscal years. Are these the most current prices quoted by reputable vendors, and are they subject to much variability?

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
DAS - CIO	Security Audits		

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

The purpose of this project is to engage a qualified firm to conduct annual security audits / assessments of the information technology infrastructure for state government. Topics of interest include network security, wireless security, application security, and security policies and procedures. The exact scope of each security assessment will focus on one or more of these areas. The Security Work Group will help set priorities and define the scope of work for each assessment.

The NITC security policies (Information Security Management Policy) provide guidance for establishing effective security programs. One requirement is to conduct regular security audits. The Network Security Policy states, "An audit of network security should be conducted annually."

The HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) proposed rule for Security and Electronic Signature Standards (45 CFR Part 142) imposes a comprehensive set of security requirements for "covered entities" that "electronically maintain or transmit any health information relating to an individual." The regulations pertaining to "Administrative Procedures to Guard Data Integrity, Confidentiality, and Availability" includes a requirement for "Security Testing." Given the breadth of HIPAA requirements and the potential penalties for violators, state government requires an independent evaluation of compliance efforts.

Guidelines pertaining to federal Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response grants require "regular independent validation and verification of Internet security, vulnerability assessment, and security and continuity of operations..." (Critical Capacity #13, Focus Area E – Health Alert Network / Communications and Information Technology).

The National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace recommends that state and local governments "establish IT security programs ... including awareness, audits, and standards."

In 2003, the Office of the CIO engaged Omnitech Corporation to conduct an external perimeter security sweep of the state's network. The initial evaluation took place during April to June of 2003. This included an automated vulnerability scan and testing of devices exposed to the Internet. In March 2004, Omnitech conducted a second vulnerability scan of the state's network.

FUNDING SUMMARY

The budget request is for \$50,000 per year in cash fund authority. The source of cash fund will be the Information Technology Infrastructure Fund. Effort will be made to identify additional funding sources.

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	12	14	14	13.3	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	23	24	24	23.7	25
V: Technical Impact	18	19	19	18.7	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	7	10	9	8.7	10
VII: Risk Assessment	8	9	9	8.7	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	17	19	20	18.7	20
TOTAL				92	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	- Very good list of goals, objectives, etc. I recommend this be expanded to include a risk-assessment of any identified vulnerabilities. We'd then not only know what might happen if something is not fixed but we'd also know the odds of it happening at all. - Clear and concise.	- While this contains a clear statement of benefit to the state agencies, isn't there also a case to be made for the "protection" and confidence of the "citizenry" who also directly and indirectly benefit?
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- We just need to make sure that we get what we pay for in this area (i.e. security assessments)	- Item 5 - might it build a better case if you noted that this a foundation step toward building a security program? What's proposed would be more efficient than individual activities, more comprehensive and objective, and provide a better roadmap for the state.
V: Technical Impact	- This project can, conceivably, have a major technical impact on other projects if installed features and functionality prove to contain major security flaws. Accordingly, this project can have a very long arm into all aspects of information technology.	- In Item 8 - "Project will help with implementing security policies" should be "will provide strategic and tactical inputs for inclusion in framing security policies"?
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	- I appreciate the thoroughness of the Preliminary Implementation Plan although I personally would like to see a more aggressive schedule.	- Item 10. Given the urgency, importance and statute issues with this project, why wait until Nov 2005 to start?
VII: Risk Assessment		- Item 14 - to get "buy-in" should some form on educational awareness and implication to the stakeholders (business and I/T) be part of risk mitigation? Point is to get them to become the partners in the process.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget		

TECHNICAL PANEL AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

APPLICATION FOR STATE RECORDS BOARD GRANT TO IMPROVE ACCESS TO PUBLIC INFORMATION

Agencies desiring grants from the Nebraska State Records Board for projects to improve access to state government information should complete this application and follow any procedures outlined in this application and any accompanying materials.

I. Grant Summary

1. Name of agency applying for grant.

Department of Administrative Services, State Personnel Division

2. Title of project.

Online Employment Application Redesign

3. Brief description of project.

Since 1999, the Personnel Division has offered prospective state employees the opportunity to complete the state employment application online. Currently, about 80% of all employment applications are processed through the system, significantly improving the efficiency of division operations. The upgrade is necessary due to the system's age and the desire for several enhancements to make the system more user-friendly and to improve performance.

4. Grant request amount

\$25,000

5. Will there be a fee for accessing records associated with this project?

No.

6. If yes, provide any statutory reference or authorization for the fee.

N/A

II. Grant Detail

1. Please describe the project in detail (you may attach this description).

The State Personnel Division has offered an online state employment application for more than five years. The system is now handling about 80% of all state employment applications. The purpose of the grant is to redesign the system, making improvements in navigation, information storage, and other features.

The end product will be a system that allows users to store and retrieve application information, print applications for filing, and dissemination of applicant data to hiring agencies.

Specifically, the redesigned tracking system will:

- Allow applicants to navigate back & forth between pages of the application. Currently, applicants cannot return to prior pages and edit information;
- Provide a resume template and executive summary template as a convenience to applicants (not currently available);

- Allow applicants to exit the application prior to completion, and return at a later time to pick up where they left off (not available currently);
- Allow applicants to submit an application, print the application for their records, then return at a later time to edit information in that application (not available currently);
- Allow applicants to create login accounts for the purposes described above (not available currently);
- Allow hiring agencies to access applicant information online (not available currently);
- Provide electronic confirmation that an application was received and resides in the database (not available currently);
- Automatically notify applicants when a position has additional requirements, and provide a link to the proper requirements (not available currently).

2. Please describe who the beneficiary or recipient of this service will be and projected activity for access or use of the proposed service.

Prospective state employees that are required to complete a standard state employment application will benefit from the proposed enhancements. Also, the online system has proven to be an effective alternative to completing the form on paper, and has introduced much-needed efficiency gains into division operations. These benefits will be expanded through the proposed enhancements.

3. Timeline for implementation (specific completion date must be provided, grant funds lapse if not expended prior to completion date).

Target completion date for the redesigned system is April 4, 2005.

4. Agency contribution to the project (labor, equipment, etc.).

State Personnel staff will assist with requirements definition, review and testing of the system. No additional division equipment will be required.

5. Has this project ever been submitted as a budget request (explain)?

No. The original system was developed by Nebrask@ Online through its contractual relationship with the State Records Board. No budgetary appropriation was required.

6. Does the project require additional statutory authority (explain)?

No. The DAS State Personnel Division currently has all necessary statutory authority for the project.

7. Why is the grant money needed for the project, and if applicable, how will the service be sustained once the grant money is expended?

Grant funds will be used to support work by Nebrask@ Online through all aspects of the project. The redesigned system will be sustained through normal NOL revenue sources under its contract with the State Records Board.

8. Please describe how this project will enhance the delivery of state agency services or access to those services (you may attach a separate sheet if needed).

The current system has introduced a number of productivity improvements in State Personnel. However, five years of experience with the current system and user suggestions have identified several issues that should be addressed. The redesigned system will address these issues and incorporate industry best practices:

- Improved functionality for applicants, State Personnel and hiring agencies. For example:
 - The resume template will help to standardize the format of this information and reduce the number of resumes sent on paper or by separate electronic communication;
 - The executive summary template will replace a paper cover letter and allow the applicant to summarize relevant qualifications;
 - Hiring agencies will have a number of tools at their disposal to identify and review information from prospective employees.
- Significant improvements in the utility of the system for applicants and State Personnel staff, with an expected corresponding reduction in processing time due to automation of several features.

9. Please describe and provide supporting documentation for how this project will 1) improve the efficiency of agency operations; 2) facilitate collaboration among state agencies; 3) facilitate collaboration between state agencies and other public institutions; 4) support public/private partnerships in the delivery of public services (you may respond to any or all of these criteria in your answer, attach additional pages if needed).

Expected improvements in the efficiency of agency operations are outlined in previous sections of this application. The intended redesign of the online employment application will enable agencies to take advantage of recent technological improvements resulting in greater efficiencies related to the processing and referral of potential state employees. The project will continue the established partnership between the state and its contracted network manager.

III. Technical Information

1. Describe the hardware, software, and communications needed for this project and explain why these choices were made.

The system will be developed on and reside on NOL's existing hardware, software and communications platforms. Integration with State Personnel's current system may be required. Access to the system will be through the Internet, with appropriate security measures in place as required. No additional hardware, software or communications services will be required by State Personnel.

2. Address any technical issues with the proposed technology, including:

- **Conformity with generally accepted industry standards. Projects which interface with other state systems (such as distance learning systems) should also address NITC technical standards and guidelines.**

System design and development will be conducted in conformity with NOL and industry best practices. Any integration required with the State Personnel system will be done in conformity with NITC technical standards and guidelines.

- **Compatibility with existing institutional and/or statewide infrastructure**

NOL systems currently integrate with the state communications network for a variety of purposes. This system will operate in the same manner.

- **Reliability, security and scalability (future needs for growth or adaptation).**

Since the system will reside on the NOL infrastructure, standards for reliability and security will conform to network requirements. Scalability should not be an issue, and in fact will be

easier to accommodate than the current system which requires a high volume of storage for document images that will no longer be required. In addition, it is very unlikely that large fluctuations in the volume of applications received will occur.

3. Describe how technical support will be provided.

Support for the application will be a team effort between NOL and State Personnel. Administrative support (i.e. questions related to content of the application form, procedures, etc.) will be handled by State Personnel. Technical questions regarding performance of the system itself will be handled by NOL. A list of frequently-asked questions and contact information for support will be provided throughout the system.

IV. Contact person information, signature

Contact person for any questions regarding this application

Name	Charles Roberson	Loraine Epperly
Phone #	402-471-3678	402-471-4456
E-mail	croberso@notes.state.ne.us	lepperly@notes.state.ne.us

Signed this _____ day of _____,

Agency Director

Please Return to:

**State Records Board
Suite 2300, State Capitol
P.O. Box 94608
Lincoln, NE 68509-4608**

Revised 9/29/03



NEBRASKA INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

**Lotus Notes Standards for State Government
Agencies**

Category	Groupware Architecture
Title	Lotus Notes Standards for State Government Agencies: 1. Password Requirements 2. User Names 3. Generic Notes Ids 4. Server Names 5. Organizational Unit Names 6. Group Naming Conventions
Number	

Applicability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Government Agencies , excluding Higher Education; and agencies receiving an exemption pursuant to Section 4.2 Standard <input type="checkbox"/> State Government Agencies , all Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> State Funded Entities - All entities receiving state funding for matters covered by this document..... Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ Not Applicable Definitions: Standard - Adherence is required. Certain exceptions and conditions may appear in this document, all other deviations from the standard require prior approval of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission after review by the Technical Panel (see Section 4.2). Guideline - Adherence is voluntary.
---------------	--

Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Adopted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Draft <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
Dates	Date: September 16, 2004 Date Adopted by NITC: Other:

1.0 Technical Standard(s)

1.1 Password Requirements:

The Lotus Notes password requirements must meet the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC) Security Policies -- Access Control Policy password standards. Using a Lotus Notes password strength of 8 or more is recommended to meet SGC standard.

1.2 User Names:

If two users with the same name work in the same agency, the Full Lotus Notes User Name must be unique. A middle initial or other identifier must be added to make the names unique.

Examples:

Jane Q. Doe

Jane (HHSS) Doe

1.3 Generic Notes IDs:

Generic Notes IDs are not acceptable.

As an alternative, the following options are available:

A standard mail-in database is recommended for sending and receiving mail when an agency has the need for multiple people to receive/respond to email.

A business unit mail-in database is recommended for sending and receiving mail when an agency has the need to protect the identity of the user(s) and ensure accountability to and from a shared mail file.

1.4 Server Common Names:

The Domino Server Common Name must be fully qualified so it can resolve to a configured IP address. A fully qualified name consists of a local host name and domain name. The Domino Server Name must be comprised of Common Name, Organizational Unit, and Organization.

Examples:

HHSSMAIL01.HHS.STATE.NE.US/HHSS/NEBRLN

RRRMAIL1.RRR.STATE.NE.US/RRR/ACME

1.5 Organizational Unit Names:

Organizational Unit Names must be 3 to 8 characters in length and must identify the Agency/Department.

1.6 Group Naming Convention:

Group Names must start with the owning agency first level Organizational Unit. The rest of the Group Name must be followed by a descriptive name identifying the Group's use. The components must be separated by an underscore (_) character or a blank space.

Examples: HHSS_Accounting, DAS_Accounting, DOC Accounting

2.0 Purpose and Objectives

2.1 Password Requirements:

Strict control over passwords is required for application security including email.

An ID that allows multiple users to send messages is considered a security risk. This includes individually assigned user IDs where the password is shared with other staff.

The use of multi-user IDs will NOT be allowed. Individuals can delegate the management of their email and calendar without sharing their password.

Mail-in databases can be used to allow multiple users to read and send memos from a shared location.

2.2 User Names:

Lotus Notes doesn't allow duplicate Lotus Notes User Names.

2.3 Generic Notes IDs:

A Generic Notes ID is any account that does not clearly identify an individual person or employee. Generic accounts are a security risk to an entire system and are not permitted except in an isolated environment.

2.4 Server Common Names:

To improve network connectivity the Domino servers must follow a fully qualified naming convention. The Domino server names will begin with an agency qualifier (the Lotus first level Organizational Unit is recommended), followed by the organization's DNS Domain Name.

2.5 Organizational Unit Names:

Allow for the access to specific resources by groups of users.

Allow the capability to apply security desktop archive, setup and registration policies to group of users.

Allow the ability to make users with same names unique based on their agency name.

2.6 Group Naming Convention:

Allows multiple agencies to have groups that serve the same function.

3.0 Definitions

3.1 Domino Server Name:

Server Name/Agency/Organization

3.2 First Level Organizational Level:

Joe Smith/CSI/DOC/NEBRLN where DOC is the first level Organizational Name

3.3 DNS:

Domain Name Server

3.4 Isolated Environment:

Server(s) that cannot send e-mail outside it's own environment and that can send mail only to defined users in the isolated environment.

4.0 Applicability

4.1 State Government Agencies

This standard applies to all state government agencies, except higher education and those agencies receiving an exemption under Section 4.2.

4.2 Exemption

Exemptions may be granted by the NITC upon request by an agency.

4.2.1 Exemption Process

Any agency may request an exemption from this standard by submitting a "Request for Exemption" to the NITC. Requests should state the reason for the exemption. Reasons for an exemption include, but are not limited to: statutory exclusion; federal government requirements; or financial hardship. Requests may be submitted to the Office of the CIO via e-mail (info@cio.state.ne.us) or letter (Office of the CIO, 521 S

14th Street, Suite 301, Lincoln, NE 68508). Requests will be considered by the NITC after review by the Technical Panel.

5.0 Responsibility

Agencies utilizing Lotus Notes.

6.0 Related Policies, Standards and Guidelines



NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Lotus Notes Guidelines for State Government Agencies

Category	Groupware Architecture
Title	Lotus Notes Guidelines for State Government Agencies: 1. Internet Address 2. Similar Names
Number	

Applicability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Government Agencies , excluding Higher Education Guideline <input type="checkbox"/> State Government Agencies , all Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> State Funded Entities - All entities receiving state funding for matters covered by this document..... Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ Not Applicable Definitions: Standard - Adherence is required. Certain exceptions and conditions may appear in this document, all other deviations from the standard require prior approval of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission after review by the Technical Panel. Guideline - Adherence is voluntary.
---------------	--

Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Adopted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Draft <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
Dates	Date: September 16, 2004 Date Adopted by NITC: Other:

Authority: Neb. Rev. Stat. § 86-516(6)
<http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/>

1.0 Technical Guidelines:

1.1 Internet Address:

The following naming conventions can be used for Internet addresses:

Preferred:

[FirstName.LastName@xxx.ne.gov](#)

Acceptable:

[FirstName.LastName@xxx.state.ne.us](#)

[FLLLLLLL@xxx.ne.gov](#)

[FLLLLLLL@xxx.state.ne.us](#)

[FLastName@xxx.ne.gov](#)

[FLastName@xxx.state.ne.us](#)

[FLLLLLLL@xxx.state.ne.us](#) ,

where F is the first character of the first name,
LLLLLLL is up to the first seven characters of the last name.

[FLastName@xxx.state.ne.us](#),

where F is the first character of the first name,
LastName is the user full last name.

xxx can be any Division of Communications (DOC) approved identifier.

1.2 Similar Names:

When names are similar, distinguishing information should be added in the address book to the Middle Name field after the name is registered in Notes. The recommended information is either the Agency, Department, or City.

2.0 Purpose and Objectives:

2.1 Internet Address:

The internet address should clearly identify the recipient as a member of Nebraska State Government and what agency they work for.

2.2 Similar Names:

With thousands of users on the same system there are going to be several users with similar names. As a result, sometimes critical/confidential e-mail is addressed to the wrong individual.

3.0 Definitions

NA

4.0 Applicability

This guideline applies to all state government agencies, except Higher Education. Adherence to guidelines is voluntary.

5.0 Responsibility

Agencies utilizing Lotus Notes.

6.0 Related Policies, Standards and Guidelines

NA



Nebraska Information Technology Commission

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Identity and Access Management Standard for State Government Agencies

Category	Security Architecture
Title	Identity and Access Management Standard for State Government Agencies.
Number	

Applicability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Government Agencies, excluding Higher Education; and agencies receiving an exemption pursuant to Section 4.2..... Standard <input type="checkbox"/> State Government Agencies, all Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> State Funded Entities - All entities receiving state funding for matters covered by this document..... Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ Not Applicable
	Definitions: Standard - Adherence is required. Certain exceptions and conditions may appear in this document, all other deviations from the standard require prior approval of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission after review by the Technical Panel (see Section 4.2). Guideline - Adherence is voluntary.

Status	<input type="checkbox"/> Adopted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Draft <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
Dates	Date: October 26, 2004 Date Adopted by NITC: Other:

1.0 Standard:

All state government web applications that require authentication and authorization of users will utilize the enterprise LDAP directory, known as Nebraska Directory Services.

2.0 Purpose and Objectives:

The purpose of this standard is to provide an enterprise solution for identity and access management capabilities to reduce security administration costs, ensure regulatory compliance, and increase operation efficiency and effectiveness. This standard focuses on web applications, because most if not all new applications will utilize web technology. To incorporate non-web applications into the Nebraska Directory Services would require additional cost and different policies to implement.

Objectives include:

- Build an identity-based portal (My.Ne.gov) that can integrate disparate applications, enable secure web access to applications and data, and enable users to access applications from their offices or remote locations.
- Implement a standardized, secure identify and access management architecture that provides centralized management with local administration of users, centralized user identity information, synchronized user identity information across multiple applications (where appropriate), and application-level authentication and authorization based on the unique identity of the user (as opposed to a shared logon ID).
- Use standards-based technology to ease application integration, provide for reuse of components and remain adaptable in the face of changing technology products.
- Ensure a solution that is scalable to meet the current and future needs of state agencies, their employees, clients and customers, and business partners.
- Meet federal security requirements for identity and access management, including HIPAA and NCIC security regulations.
- Provide a high level of security including the option of two-factor identification.

3.0 Definitions:

3.1 Authentication – The process of uniquely identifying an individual.

Authentication ensures that the individual is who he or she claims to be, but says nothing about the access rights of the individual.

3.2 Authorization – The process of giving individuals access to system objects based on their identity which allows them to add, update, delete or view information for a web application.

3.3 Identify and Access Management – Enterprise Identity Management is a system of technologies, business practices, laws and policies that manages common identification of user objects; reduce the costs while enhancing the quality of government services; protects the integrity of state resources; and safeguards the privacy of the individual.

3.4 LDAP – LDAP (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol) is an Internet protocol that applications use to look up user information from a server, such as Novell's eDirectory.

3.5 Web Applications – Web server based applications that are accessed using a web browser. This definition includes custom developed systems and third party software systems.

4.0 Applicability

4.1 State Government Agencies

This standard applies to all state government agencies, boards, and commissions, except Higher Education and those agencies receiving an exemption under Section 4.2.

4.1.1 State Agencies, Boards, and Commissions

All new web applications requiring authentication and authorization of individuals must comply with the standard listed in Section 1.0. All existing web applications requiring authentication and authorization must convert to the standard listed in Section 1.0 as soon as fiscally prudent or upon an upgrade to the web application, whichever comes first, unless the application is exempt.

4.2 Exemption

Exemptions may be granted by the NITC upon request by an agency.

4.2.1 Exemption Process

Any agency may request an exemption from this standard by submitting a "Request for Exemption" to the NITC. Requests should state the reason for the exemption. Reasons for an exemption include, but are not limited to: statutory exclusion; federal government requirements; or financial hardship. Requests may be submitted to the Office of the CIO via e-mail (info@cio.state.ne.us) or letter (Office of the CIO, 521 S 14th Street, Suite 301, Lincoln, NE 68508). Requests will be considered by the NITC after review by the Technical Panel.

5.0 Responsibility

5.1 IMServices

IMServices will incorporate the needed hardware and software into their infrastructure to provide the following:

- LDAP directory for user /entity objects.
- Role-based authentication and authorization to the enterprise LDAP directory and applicable applications for registered users.
- Business/disaster recovery.
- Authentication methods available:
 - User ID and password
 - Two-factor authentication
 - X.509 certificates

5.2 State Agencies, Boards and Commissions

Agencies, Boards and Commissions will carry out the following responsibilities:

- Web applications requiring authentication and authorization must comply with the standard listed in Section 1.0.
- Require this standard be referenced in all RFPs (Requests for Purchase) for web applications covered by this standard.

5.3 State Government Council Directory Services Workgroup

The State Government Council's Directory Services Workgroup will provide ongoing advice and direction, including but not limited to:

- Policies for implementation;
- Benchmarks and service level agreements;
- Funding options.

6.0 Related Policies, Standards and Guidelines

- NITC Information Security Management Policy – January 23, 2001
- NITC Access Control Policy – January 23, 2001
- NITC Network Security Policy – January 23, 2001
- State Government Council's Directory Services Workgroup Phase I recommendation – July 30, 2003

DRAFT

Date of Last Revision: September 28, 2004

Nebraska Information Technology Commission Strategic Initiatives

Strategic Plan

Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network

Objective

The Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network will provide the opportunity for all hospitals and public health departments to connect, providing access to consultations with medical specialists, continuing medical education, transmission of digital clinical information, bioterrorism alerts and training for homeland security and other emergency management issues.

Benefits

The Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network (NSTN) will implement the vision of a high-speed health video telecommunication information system capable of erasing distance as a barrier to access to high quality health care for all people in Nebraska. Research shows that telehealth telecommunications services will:

- Increase the ability to diagnose patients' illnesses;
- Improve the quality and administration of medical services;
- Strengthen rural physicians' ties to specialty care;
- Alleviate the isolation of rural providers;
- Enhance the ability to attract and retain primary care physicians, medical professionals and support staff;
- Facilitate the training of health professionals in rural communities; and
- Enable patients to stay close to home for their care.
- Improve access to consultations with mental health practitioners, radiologists, and other medical specialists.

In addition, the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network will enable the delivery of bioterrorism alerts and training to hospitals and public health departments across the state.

Current Status

- The Nebraska Hospital Association, in partnership with the Nebraska Public Service Commission, Nebraska Health and Human Services System, Nebraska Information

Technology Commission and Office of the Chief Information Officer, Nebraska Division of Communications, University of Nebraska, University of Nebraska Medical Center, Nebraska hospital telehealth hubs and hospitals, Central Nebraska Area Health Education Center, telecommunications providers, the Nebraska Information Network, and the Universal Services Administrative Company (Federal Universal Service Fund Administrator), is leading an effort to create a statewide telehealth network.

- In August 2004, connections between hub hospitals and their connecting rural hospitals were initiated; in addition other sites such as the Nebraska State Office Building were included. This initial test of the system is part of a systematic process for connecting all Nebraska hospitals, which are currently participating in Nebraska-based telehealth systems. Additionally, all hospitals that wish to participate will be incorporated into the system as they have the capability at their individual site.
- All rural hospitals have been offered the opportunity to purchase video conferencing equipment. This funding has been made available through various federal grant programs and through funding provided through the Nebraska Health and Human Services System. Additionally, options are being explored to fund endpoint video equipment in the public health departments. Currently, memorandums of understanding are being sought by the public health departments with their local hospitals to provide connectivity.
- The Public Service Commission is expected to approve plans for providing support for the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network through the Nebraska Universal Service Fund in September 2004. This funding will be part of a funding mechanism that includes the Universal Services Administrative Company, the Nebraska Public Service Commission and the individual hospitals.
- The Nebraska Office of Rural Health is planning a telehealth workshop on Sept. 10 in Kearney to help rural hospitals prepare to use the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network.

Future

- All Nebraska hospitals and health departments will be connected to the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network in 2005-2006.
- Additional telecommunications infrastructure will be deployed to enable the efficient operation of the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network. The plan submitted to the Nebraska Public Service Commission in July 2004 by the Nebraska Hospital Association includes the following components:
 - Connection routers at six hub sites;
 - Accord bridge added at one site;
 - Endpoint routers at 68 endpoint hospitals ;
 - Scheduling software;
 - Endpoint firewalls at 68 endpoint hospitals;

- Firewalls at 7 hub sites;
 - Gatekeeper technology;
 - Installation costs for T-1 lines and fiber for endpoint hospitals; and
 - Connectivity of the statewide network
- The plan submitted to the Public Service Commission plan envisions a network backbone connectivity scheme for 2004-2005 consisting of the following:
 - Scottsbluff to Grand Island --- 4 T-1 lines
 - North Platte --- Dark Fiber Solutions - 100 mbps line
 - Kearney to Grand Island --- 6 T-1 lines
 - Grand Island to Lincoln --- 4 T-1 lines
 - Grand Island to Omaha --- 6 T-1 lines
 - Grand Island (St. Francis Medical Center) to Central Nebraska AHEC --- 6 T-1 lines
 - Dark Fiber Solutions connection in Grand Island --- 100 mbps line
 - Lincoln (St. Elizabeth Regional Medical Center) to Omaha (UNMC) --- 1 T-1 line*
 - Lincoln (BryanLGH Medical Center) to Omaha (UNMC) --- 1 T-1 line*
 - Norfolk to Omaha --- 6 T-1 lines

*While this may initially be one T-1 line per location, an increase in subsequent years is likely.

- Rural hospitals that currently have multiple lines connecting them to two different hub hospitals will be able to access the services of any hub hospital in Nebraska through just one line in 2005-2006.
- Use of the network for consultations and continuing medical education will increase.

Recommended Actions

(NOTE: These recommendations are still subject to change, pending additional advice from those entities that are participating in this strategic initiative.)

- A. Integrate Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network with statewide synchronous video network and Network Nebraska.** The value of a network increases as more connections are added. Connecting the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network with the proposed statewide synchronous video network creates more value than the sum of their values as independent networks. Integrating the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network with Network Nebraska may lead to more efficient use of state resources and potential cost savings or cost avoidance.

Actions include:

1. Identify options for integrating the Nebraska Telehealth Network with the statewide synchronous video network and Network Nebraska.
 - a. Lead Entity: Technical Panel

- b. Timeframe: May 31, 2004
- c. Funding: No funding required for this task

B. Provide continued support for telehealth through the Nebraska Universal Service Fund. On December 17, 2002, the Nebraska Public Service Commission approved the use of up to \$900,000 a year from the Nebraska Universal Service Fund to support telehealth. A detailed plan for support for the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network was submitted to the Commission by the Nebraska Hospital Association on July 9, 2004. The plan is expected to be approved in September. 2003-2004 support requested from the Nebraska Universal Service Funding is \$145,570. The total projected cost for the period July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005 is \$813,766.23.

Actions include:

- 1. Report on any changes to legislation or regulations that would impact continued support of telehealth through the Nebraska Universal Service Fund to the Community Council and Nebraska Information Technology Commission at least annually.
 - a. Lead Entity: Telehealth Subcommittee
 - b. Timeframe: September 1, 2005
 - d. Funding: No funding required for this task

C. Ensure continued support for telehealth from the federal Universal Service Fund by monitoring federal legislation impacting the Universal Service Fund. The Rural Health Care Fund of the federal Universal Service Fund is a key funding component of the Nebraska Telehealth Network. Approximately \$536,000 of federal support will be provided for 2003-2004.

Actions include:

- 1. Monitor legislation, regulations, or other threats to the continued support of telehealth through the Nebraska Universal Service Fund and update the Community Council and Nebraska Information Technology Commission at least annually.
 - a. Lead Entity: Telehealth Subcommittee
 - b. Timeframe: September 1, 2005
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task

D. Encourage continued cooperation of all entities involved in the development and management of the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network by facilitating meetings on specific issues as needed. Partners include hospitals across the state of Nebraska, the Nebraska Hospital Association, the Nebraska Health and Human Services System; the Nebraska Information Technology Commission/Office of the Chief Information Officer; the Nebraska Division of Communications; The University of Nebraska, the Nebraska Public Service Commission, and telecommunications providers.

Actions include:

- 1. Report on any issues or problems, and if necessary facilitate meetings to bring interested parties together to discuss and resolve the issue.
 - a. Lead Entity: Telehealth Subcommittee

- b. Timeframe: September 1, 2005
- c. Funding: No funding required for this task

E. Provide assistance to hospitals and to the Nebraska Hospital Association to address issues pertaining to network administration and management.

Members of the Technical Panel and CAP, the entity responsible for the development and administration of Network Nebraska, have provided technical assistance to the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network. As both Network Nebraska and the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network develop and address administration and network management, the Technical Panel may be able to provide assistance to the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network. Opportunities to leverage resources should be explored.

Actions include:

1. Meet with the Technical Subcommittee of the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network to discuss issues related to network administration and management.
 - a. Lead Entity: Technical Panel
 - b. Timeframe: May 31, 2005
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task

F. Provide assistance in promoting the use of the network to doctors, administrators, and health care providers. A workshop on telehealth targeting hospital technical staff and administrators was held in Grand Island on April 27, 2004. Another workshop is scheduled for September 10 in Kearney. Sponsors of the workshops have included the Nebraska Office of Rural Health and Central Nebraska Area Health Education Center. Another workshop is planned on September 10, 2004 in Kearney as part of the Nebraska Rural Health Association's annual conference. The event is sponsored by the Nebraska Rural Health Association and co-sponsored by the Nebraska Office of Rural Health and the University of Nebraska Medical Center. Many of the entities involved in health and medical education participate in the NITC's Telehealth Subcommittee. The NITC Telehealth subcommittee should serve as a vehicle for encouraging and coordinating educational and promotional programming to advance the use of telehealth.

Actions include:

1. Form a subcommittee to develop a plan for future educational programming.
 - a. Lead Entity: Telehealth Subcommittee
 - b. Timeframe: November 15, 2004
2. Organize at least one educational program on an issue related to the delivery and expansion of telehealth.
 - a. Lead Entity: Telehealth Subcommittee
 - b. Timeframe: September 1, 2005

DRAFT

Date of Last Revision: September 28, 2004

Nebraska Information Technology Commission Strategic Initiatives

Strategic Plan For Network Nebraska

Objectives

The primary objective of this initiative is to develop a broadband, scalable telecommunications infrastructure that optimizes the quality of network services to every public entity in the State of Nebraska.

Benefits

Through aggregation of demand, adoption of common standards, and collaboration with network services and applications, participants can achieve many benefits, including:

- Lower network costs;
- Greater efficiency for participating entities;
- Interoperability of systems providing video courses and conferencing;
- Increased collaboration among all K-20 educational entities;
- New educational opportunities;
- Competitiveness with surrounding states; and
- Better use of public investments.

Current Status

The Division of Communications, the University of Nebraska, Nebraska Educational Telecommunications Commission, Department of Education, Public Service Commission, and the Nebraska Information Technology Commission have formed the Collaborative Aggregation Partnership (CAP) to guide and implement Network Nebraska. The Division of Communications and University of Nebraska have entered into a memorandum of agreement to formalize their participation in this joint effort.

Using existing resources and aggregating existing demand from state government and the University of Nebraska, CAP has developed a multipurpose core backbone extending from Norfolk, Omaha, Lincoln, Grand Island, Kearney, North Platte, and Alliance. A shared circuit also connects Scottsbluff to the backbone at Grand Island.

State and University circuits have been moved to the backbone to take advantage of the economies and efficiencies offered by aggregation. The K-20 community has started to

migrate to this service as contracts have allowed. Project 42 (consisting of ESUs 10, 11, 15 and 16) has purchased services from Network Nebraska to serve the schools in their areas.

A contract has been signed for Internet 1 service that will allow Network Nebraska to begin to offer lower rates to network participants. This could significantly increase participation in Network Nebraska. Internet 2 service is also available to educational participants through the University of Nebraska.

Future

The major components of this initiative include:

1. Development of a scalable, reliable, and secure telecommunications infrastructure that enables any type of eligible entity (i.e. local and state government, public and private K-12 and higher education, health care institutions) to purchase the amount of service that the entities need, when they need it, on an annual basis;
2. Establishment of a catalog of value-added applications that enables eligible entities to pick and choose services that are pertinent to them (e.g. Internet1, Internet2, and videoconferencing);
3. Investigate possible implementation of a network operations center that offers a helpdesk, network diagnostics, and engineering assistance in order to ensure acceptable qualities of service;
4. Investigate establishment of a billing or accounting center to accept service orders, extend service agreements, provide consolidated billing, and to maintain customer accounts.

Recommended Actions

(NOTE: These recommendations are still subject to change, pending additional advice from those entities that are participating in this strategic initiative.)

Goals for Network Nebraska for the remainder of FY 2005.

- 1) Develop and offer Internet I services to eligible network participants by January 10, 2005
 - a. University of Nebraska signs contract with provider for Internet I services no later than August 31, 2004.
 - b. Division of Communications purchases Internet I services from the University no later than September 15, 2004.
 - c. Collaborative Aggregation Partnership (CAP) agrees on rates to be charged to eligible network participants for Internet I services no later than September 15, 2004.
 - d. Working through the NITC and the various Councils, CAP will distribute information related to the new Internet I charges to eligible network participants during the months of October, November and December 2004.

- e. Orders will be taken by CAP for new service and the circuits will be provisioned during the months of October, November and December, 2004.
 - f. Internet I service turned up the first working day of January, 2005 for initial orders.
- 2) Identify Tier II communities that offer opportunities for aggregation for services onto the network – ongoing.
- a. Both the University and the State will begin by providing a list to CAP of the communities where service is currently being provisioned that indicates the total amount of bandwidth currently being consumed no later than September 15, 2004.
 - b. CAP will analyze the listings for opportunities to aggregate the existing service when coupled with other opportunities within the community no later than November 15, 2004.
 - c. CAP will order service for the next Tier II community aggregation no later than January 15, 2005.
 - d. New service will be provisioned by the provider and the move of existing service will be coordinated by CAP with the customer between January and March of 2005.
 - e. Opportunities for the next Tier II community will be explored and started over again no later than May 15, 2005.
- 3) Create a Service Level Agreement for use by CAP and the eligible network participants no later than November 1, 2004.
- a. CAP will work with appropriate legal counsel to establish a Service Level Agreement that will detail the service that is being provided to the client. These meetings will take place thru August and September with a final draft document due September 30, 2004.
 - b. CAP will review the document with agency and university leadership, as well as the Chair of the NITC with final approval no later than October 15, 2004.
 - c. CAP will make the final adjustments to the document and the document will be ready for distribution to eligible network participants by November 1, 2004.
- 4) Create a Network Nebraska Level 1 Helpdesk no later than November 1, 2004.
- a. Members of CAP will estimate the numbers of calls that they are currently taking regarding information about Network Nebraska over the months of July and August 2004. That information will be collected by the CAP chair at the September 2004 meeting.
 - b. A subcommittee of CAP consisting of the technical people will conduct a review of help desk software during the months of August and September. A recommendation will be brought to the CAP group at the October 2004 meeting.
 - c. CAP has determined that the Level 1 Helpdesk will reside at NET. In order to transfer calls between the members of CAP, the NET telephone system will need an upgrade. This upgrade will be accomplished no later than October 31, 2004.

- d. An 800 number will be installed for use by the Level 1 Helpdesk and eligible clients. The 800 number will be ordered by September 15, 2004 and turned up for service no later than November 1, 2004.
- 5) Create a Network Nebraska Website no later than December 15, 2004.
- a. CAP will identify url for website no later than August 15, 2004.
 - b. The office of the NITC will identify initial information for the web site and present the information to CAP at the September 2004 CAP meeting.
 - c. After approval from CAP, a “test” web site will be developed by and hosted at Nebraska On-Line no later than October 15, 2004.
 - d. CAP members will test the web site and make suggestions to the NITC staff through November 30, 2004.
 - e. Final changes will be made to the web site and the site will be unveiled to the users no later than December 15, 2004.
- 6) Meet with the Technical Subcommittee of the Nebraska Statewide Telehealth Network to discuss issues related to network administration and management.
- a. Lead Entity: Technical Panel
 - b. Timeframe: May 31, 2005
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task

Nebraska Information Technology Commission Strategic Initiatives

Strategic Plan for the Statewide Synchronous Video Network

Objective

The objective of this initiative is to achieve a statewide synchronous video network capable of enhancing educational opportunities and citizen services through the exchange of interactive video between and among various sectors.

In order to accomplish this, a number of tasks must be completed.

- Identification of a single audio and video standard for low-bandwidth distance learning and videoconferencing;
- Acquisition of upgrade or replacement equipment and/or software that ensures compliance with the audio and video standard;
- Development or purchase of a scheduling system or enterprise resource management program that allows potential users to A) know the location and availability of resources, and B) set up or reserve ad hoc or regularly scheduled events with other entities;
- Development of a network bandwidth management system or network operations center that assures pre-determined qualities of service, depending upon the type of video traffic;
- Development of an event clearinghouse that allows promotion, marketing, and registration for interactive video events;
- Development of training modules for new users;
- Development of a cost and funding algorithm to allow shared use of the statewide backbone for interstate distance education and videoconferencing.

Benefits

Since 1992, various entities within the State of Nebraska have spent an estimated 20 million dollars on interactive video capture and display equipment, fiber connectivity, and engineering design charges to provide for distance learning and videoconferencing. Considered cutting edge technology in the early years of operation, this investment resulted in over 300 high-quality, videoconferencing classrooms using multiple, incompatible video protocols spread over numerous separate political subdivisions. These service regions were established when groups partnered together to set up

interlocal agreements in order to receive grant funds, enter into contracts and hire staff to exchange high school and college classes. Other smaller videoconferencing networks were set up by other state agencies and hospitals but were not interoperable with the school and college sites.

In order for Nebraska to maximize the potential of its investment in interactive videoconferencing and to create unprecedented educational opportunities, all videoconferencing sites in this State must be in compliance with the State video compression standard and stakeholders must agree to work collaboratively to enhance the benefit for all end users.

Current Status

Currently, Nebraska enjoys one of the most robust collections of local connectivity and bandwidth among any of its rural neighbors. This equates to 192 DS-3 (45 megabit per second, JPEG and MPEG2 video) circuits to high schools served by telephone companies and 112 high school sites that are served by cable companies with 100 megabit per second, full duplex, fiber circuits with H.263 video. Only about 10 high schools are left in rural areas of the State without high bandwidth connections, many at their own choosing. Other state agency and telehealth videoconferencing circuits consist of single or double dedicated T-1 (1.55 megabit per second) lines.

Nebraska high school distance learning classrooms are some of the busiest in the country, with each classroom being used about 50% of the school day across the entire system. Taking high school credit courses and higher education dual credit and college credit courses at a distance, students are able to fulfill graduation requirements and expand their high school experiences with opportunities that are unavailable at their local high school. Some high schools permit community and adult education classes in the evening hours.

Distance learning consortia (interlocal agreements between neighboring districts) often are able to share the talents of one qualified instructor across several schools and sections of students each semester.

Unfortunately, due to the high costs of transporting high bandwidth (JPEG) video signals, distance learning consortia have been unable to afford course exchange with consortia in other parts of the State, thus limiting their credit course offerings and educational opportunities.

The original 10-year contracts between the distance learning consortia and the telephone company providers for JPEG video service will begin expiring in the Spring of 2006. With no chance of contract extensions for JPEG video service, the schools will need to upgrade to an H.323 Internet Protocol communication standard, new codecs (Coder-Decoders) to accommodate the H.263/H.264 video standards, and switch/router technology at the school site to manage the resulting data network. The later of the JPEG consortium contracts are not due to expire until 2009 but the industry has chosen to no longer manufacture nor repair JPEG video equipment, thus prompting an early conversion of these contracts to IP video.

Whereas Nebraska's (telco provided) interactive video efforts have been mostly localized with high bandwidth video, most other States have converted or are converting to IP video and have been trying to realize further educational programming through ad hoc enrichment activities and use of Internet2.

The current network will not be able to meet the future distance learning applications and the bandwidth needs for the Internet and Internet2. Therefore it is necessary to convert to the next generation distance learning (data) network.

Future

Nebraska has enormous potential to assemble one of the country's best telecommunications networks for education, health care, and government. The Nebraska Information Technology Commission and its advisory groups have fostered a collaborative environment for participative decision making among several major subsectors. The Collaborative Aggregation Partnership, a team of University of Nebraska, Division of Communications, and Nebraska Educational Telecommunications staff have been successful in negotiating statewide backbone contracts for scalable bandwidth for public entities. Technological developments and breakthroughs in routing technology in the past two years have greatly enhanced the quality of service related to IP-based, H.26X video compression.

The new Statewide Synchronous Video Network design incorporates the requirements established by the Statewide Synchronous Video Network Work Group of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission. This network design has the flexibility to support both proprietary and standard protocols, and allows the school full access to the available bandwidth. The network can grow to meet any bandwidth or application requirements, and has any optical interface available from Ethernet to OC192.

This network design is consistent with the goals of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission and will integrate into Network Nebraska. Most importantly for those who qualify, this network is eligible for E-rate discounts. All consortiums and member schools benefit because this is a plan toward statewide services and interconnectivity. Not only is video bandwidth available, but also data applications such as the Internet and Internet2. Asynchronous distance learning applications such as Blackboard, WebCT or Angel become a reality with the bandwidth that will be made available, and multiple classrooms become much more affordable.

The contracts for the current distance learning networks begin to expire in the next two years. This network is leading edge technology, is of carrier grade quality, and is scalable to meet any growth demands.

The vision of the future statewide synchronous video network includes the umbrella capacity for any interactive video unit to be able to interconnect with any other interactive video unit, regardless of location. The vision of the future also includes assurances for network security and quality of service within a particular sub-network (i.e. telehealth, State Patrol, K-12 distance learning). Most end users are in agreement that the State should purchase or contract for a single software scheduling system that can remotely

turn on a specific video unit, log system usage statistics, allow promotion of ad hoc education events, and secure permission for usage from local site coordinators.

Recommended Actions

(NOTE: These recommendations are still subject to change, pending additional advice from those entities that are participating in this strategic initiative.)

A. Identification of a single audio and video standard for low-bandwidth distance learning and videoconferencing.

Actions include:

1. Approval of the H.263/H.264 video compression protocol and G.722, G.722.1, and G.728 audio compression protocols by the Nebraska Information Technology Commission.
 - a. Lead Entity: NITC Technical Panel
 - b. Timeframe: September 9, 2004
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task

B. Acquisition of upgrade or replacement equipment and/or software that ensures compliance with the audio and video standard.

Actions include:

1. Development and submission of a Congressional funding request to fund upgrade of classroom and networking resources necessary to bring K-12 and higher education distance learning facilities into compliance.
 - a. Lead Entity: NITC Technical Panel's Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group
 - b. Timeframe: September 3, 2004
 - c. Funding: Actual request estimated at \$13 million; no funding required to develop the request.
2. Designation of a fiscal entity to oversee bidding, ordering, delivery and installation of equipment.
 - a. Lead Entity: To be named.
 - b. Timeframe: March 2005
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task.
3. Equipment RFP, bidding, ordering, delivery and installation of equipment
 - a. Lead Entity: To be named
 - b. Timeframe: August 2005 - July 2006
 - c. Funding: Funding to oversee this task included in Congressional request.

C. Development or purchase of a scheduling system or enterprise resource management program that allows potential users to know the

location and availability of resources, and/or set up or reserve ad hoc or regularly scheduled events with other entities.

Actions include:

1. Research scheduling systems and enterprise resource management programs.
 - a. Lead Agency: NITC Technical Panel's Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group
 - b. Timeframe: September 2004-December 2004
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task.
2. Purchase or develop a scheduling system and/or enterprise resource management program.
 - a. Lead Entity: To be named.
 - b. Timeframe: Summer, 2005
 - c. Funding: To be determined.

D. Explore options for a network bandwidth management system or network operations center that assures pre-determined qualities of service, depending upon the type of video traffic.

Actions include:

1. Explore options for a network operations center that assures particular qualities of service.
 - a. Lead Entity: Network Nebraska (Collaborative Aggregation Partnership)
 - b. Timeframe: Ongoing
 - c. Funding: Funding to complete this task to be determined.

E. Development of an event clearinghouse that allows promotion, marketing, and registration for interactive video events.

Actions include:

1. Development of a web-based clearinghouse that allows originators to post events and users to register for or view the date, time and frequency of individual events.
 - a. Lead Entity: Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group
 - b. Timeframe: Fall, 2006
 - c. Funding: To be determined.

F. Development of training modules for new users.

Actions include:

1. Development of training modules to accompany equipment orientation.
 - a. Lead Entity: NITC Technical Panel's Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group, in cooperation with commercial equipment manufacturer.
 - b. Timeframe: June-August, 2006 (Corresponding with equipment deployment)
 - c. Funding: To be determined.

G. Development of a cost and funding algorithm to allow shared use of the statewide backbone for interstate distance learning and videoconferencing.

Actions include:

1. Research models from other States' education networks.
 - a. Lead Entity: NITC Technical Panel's Statewide Synchronous Video Work Group, in conjunction with Network Nebraska (Collaborative Aggregation Partnership)
 - b. Timeframe: Ongoing
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission Strategic Initiatives

Strategic Plan

Community IT Planning and Development

Objective

As one strategy to remain competitive in the global economy, Nebraska communities can use information technology to enhance economic development opportunities and quality of life. Nebraska businesses can utilize information technology to expand markets, reduce costs, and improve efficiency.

Benefits

Information technology is transforming the economy and society, creating a completely new paradigm. Businesses are using telecommunications to speed up transactions, reduce costs, and expand their markets. Consumers are buying books, CDs, food, gifts, and clothing online. Families are exchanging photos via e-mail. Students at all levels are taking courses via distance learning technologies. Telemedicine is making mental health services and other specialist services available in remote, underserved areas of the state.

A coordinated effort to address the need for information technology training and development for citizens, businesses, communities, and local governments is needed to help Nebraska meet the challenges of the Information Age. These challenges include:

Encouraging the adoption of technology by citizens. According to a number of indicators and polls, however, Nebraskans are slower to adopt technology than the U.S. as a whole. In September 2001, approximately 45% of Nebraska households were online. In comparison, approximately 50% of U.S. households were online. Nearly half (49%) of Nebraska households with children (ages 3-17) had Internet access at home, ranking Nebraska 31 out of the 50 states in 2001.

Rural areas have historically lagged behind urban and suburban areas in Internet use. A study by the Pew Internet & American Life Project found that only 52% of rural residents use the Internet, compared to 67% of urban residents, and 66% of suburban residents. The difference in Internet use among urban areas can be in part explained by the demographic make-up of rural areas. Rural areas have a higher proportion of older,

less wealthy, and less educated residents than urban and suburban areas. These groups are less likely to be online.

Although Internet use by African Americans and Hispanics is increasing, both African Americans and Hispanics are also less likely to use the Internet than whites. English-speaking Asian-Americans are the most likely to use the Internet.

Women and girls are as likely to use the Internet as men and boys, but are less likely to take advanced computer classes in high school and to major in computer science or engineering in college. The Nebraska Girls and Technology Status Report sponsored by the American Association of University Women (AAUW) of Nebraska in collaboration with the Nebraska Commission on the Status of Women found that although girls and boys enroll in computer introduction and application courses in equal numbers, boys outnumber girls by more than 3 to 1 in most of the more technology-oriented courses: computer languages, computer science and computer-aided drafting. Girls are even outnumbered by more than 2 to 1 in web design and development courses.

Accelerating the deployment of advanced services. In 2003, 86% of the state's population had access to broadband either through cable modem, DSL, or fixed wireless broadband services. These services typically provide speeds of one to two megabits per second. In four to five years, some experts estimate that broadband with speeds of 25 to 40 megabits per second will be needed. In the future, mobile wireless data networks and Voice Over IP services will become increasingly important.

Providing public access to computers and the Internet. Most libraries in Nebraska provide public access to computers and the Internet. However, in some communities access is restricted by the number of computers available and by limited library hours.

Using technology to provide government and community services. Local governments can use technology to more efficiently and effectively deliver community services.

Expanding educational opportunities. Distance learning technologies are expanding educational opportunities at all levels.

Improving access to health care through information technology. Through telehealth technologies, residents of rural areas can have better access to mental health and other specialist services. Home telehealth is one of the fastest growing applications of telemedicine, but is not yet widely used in Nebraska.

Incorporating technology-related development in to local development plans. While Nebraska's larger communities are using information technology to enhance economic development opportunities, many of Nebraska's smaller communities are just beginning to realize the importance of information technology to their economic viability.

Current Status

Community information technology development is currently addressed by several organizations including the University of Nebraska, Nebraska Information Technology Commission, the Center for Rural Affairs' REAP program, the AIM Institute, and the Nebraska Department of Economic development. Some of these efforts are loosely coordinated under the umbrella of Technologies Across Nebraska, a partnership of over 40 organizations led by the University of Nebraska and the Nebraska Information Technology Commission.

- Technologies Across Nebraska, a partnership of over 40 organizations led by the University of Nebraska and the Nebraska Information Technology Commission, has worked with 15 communities or regional groups over the past two years to develop technology plans. The impact of the IT Planning and Mini Grant program has been significant. Two communities received federal grants totaling over \$400,000 to implement their plans. A new business has started in a third community. Several communities now have broadband services available. Other communities are focusing on the technology needs of small businesses, offering e-commerce and technology training. One community has developed a video conferencing center available to local businesses and residents. Efforts are made to connect participating communities with resources offered by Technologies Across Nebraska Partners, including the University of Nebraska Rural Initiative's internship program. Technologies Across Nebraska will expand the program to six additional communities this year.
- Technologies Across Nebraska has developed nationally recognized resources to help communities effectively use technology to enhance economic development, including the Community IT Planning workbook and the Community IT Toolkit. Technologies Across Nebraska's quarterly newsletter, *TANgents*, reaches 1,500 individuals.
- The University of Nebraska Rural Initiative has partnered with Congressman Osborne's office and the J. D. Edwards program to place interns in rural communities. Now in its second year, the program placed 12 interns in rural communities last summer. Many of the interns are helping local businesses and organizations effectively utilize information technology.
- Several entities currently offer e-commerce training. The University of Nebraska's Communities of the Future Team offers e-commerce training in communities. Community colleges and the Center for Rural Affairs' Reap program also offer e-commerce training. Through a federal grant, the AIM Institute is working with businesses in Fremont, Norfolk, and Columbus to develop or enhance Web sites. The Department of Economic Development has begun providing e-commerce training upon request to communities which have participated in the Business Expansion and Retention program. The Department of Economic Development's new Interasset program promises to provide technical assistance to rural businesses form strategic and growth objectives highlighting technology and international business relationships. The University of Nebraska Rural Initiative, Nebraska Rural Development Commission, and the Nebraska Information Technology Commission

are working together to promote and coordinate e-commerce training across the state.

- University of Nebraska's Communities of the Future Team offers e-government training in communities. The e-government program provides Internet training to local government officials and helps them understand how e-government can be used to more efficiently and effectively provide services and information to citizens.
- Through funding from the Secretary of State, Nebraska Online is assisting counties in developing Web. All but twenty-two counties in Nebraska now have Web sites. A number of additional counties are expected to develop Web sites within the next year.
- The Public Service Commission's Nebraska Internet Enhancement fund will provide assistance to communities, in partnership with telecommunications providers, to enhance advanced telecommunications services.
- Introductory computer and Internet training are offered by many entities including community colleges, the University of Nebraska's Communities of the Future Team, and public libraries.
- Public libraries also play an important role in providing public access to computers and the Internet. The Nebraska Library Commission maintains a database of public access sites in Nebraska available at http://www.nol.org/home/CIO/public_access/.
- The Nebraska Hospital Association is heading up an effort to develop a statewide telehealth network, which will connect all hospitals in Nebraska. Other partners in this effort include the University of Nebraska, the Nebraska Division of Communications, the Nebraska Health and Human Services System, the Office of the Chief Information Officer and the Nebraska Information Technology Commission, Nebraska hospitals, and the Nebraska Public Service Commission.

Future

Technology-related development is a continuous process, with significant progress being made. In the vision for the future, Nebraska communities will make even more effective use information technology, as evidenced by the following indicators:

- The number of cities and counties providing electronic access to information and services will increase.
- The number of communities developing local technology plans will increase.
- The number of businesses using e-commerce in Nebraska will increase.
- The number of households using the Internet will increase.

- The number of households and businesses subscribing to broadband Internet access will increase.
- All Nebraska hospitals will be connected through a statewide telehealth network.

Recommended Actions

(NOTE: These recommendations are still subject to change, pending additional advice from those entities that are participating in this strategic initiative.)

- **Support community IT development by working with the University of Nebraska and other Technologies Across Nebraska Partners.**
Actions include:
 1. Work with at least 6 community or regional technology committees to develop IT plans through the IT Planning and Mini Grant program
 - a. Lead Entity: Technologies Across Nebraska
 - b. Timeframe: September 1, 2004- September 1, 2005
 - c. Funding: \$20,000 from the NITC Community Technology Fund
 2. Provide continuing support for the 17 community and regional technology committees which have participated in the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 IT Planning and Mini Grant programs.
 - a. Lead Entity: Technologies Across Nebraska
 - b. Timeframe: ongoing
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task.
 3. Promote technology-related development through the quarterly newsletter, TANgents.
 - a. Lead Entity: Technologies Across Nebraska
 - b. Timeframe: fall 2004, winter 2005, spring 2005, summer 2005
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task.
 4. Work with the Nebraska Rural Initiative to identify options for the expanded use of youth to assist in IT development activities.
 - a. Lead Entity: Technologies Across Nebraska and Nebraska Rural Initiative
 - b. Timeframe: January 31, 2005
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task.
- **Strengthen efforts to coordinate technology-related development programs and to better incorporate technology-related development into traditional economic development efforts.** Technology-related development is just one component of a successful economic development plan. Initial efforts in this area will focus on e-commerce training coordination.
Actions include:
 1. Complete an inventory of e-commerce training programs, gap analysis and recommendations for coordinating e-commerce training.

- a. Lead Entity: Nebraska Information Technology Commission, Nebraska Rural Development Commission, and Nebraska Rural Initiative
 - b. Timeframe: November 1, 2004
 2. Develop a handout with tips for choosing a Web designer.
 - a. Lead Entity: University of Nebraska Rural Initiative and University of Nebraska Cooperative Extension
 - b. Timeframe: November 1, 2004
 3. Develop an implementation plan for e-commerce coordination.
 - a. Lead Entity: Nebraska Information Technology Commission, Nebraska Rural Development Commission, and Nebraska Rural Initiative
 - b. Timeframe: February 1, 2005
- **Request that funding for the Nebraska Information Technology Commission's Community Technology Fund be reinstated.** If fully funded, the Community Technology Fund would provide \$200,000 in funding for community technology projects.

Nebraska Information Technology Commission Strategic Initiatives

Strategic Plan for the Nebraska eLearning Initiative

Objective

The primary objective of this initiative is to promote the effective and efficient integration of technology into the instructional process and to utilize technology to deliver enhanced educational opportunities to students at all levels throughout Nebraska on an equitable and affordable basis.

This initiative also involves the establishment of a Nebraska eLearning Consortium to organize and facilitate the development and execution of a Pre-Kindergarten-Adult Education statewide eLearning strategy to:

- Connect eLearning innovators and leverage their expertise and experience;
- Build collaborative relationships between K-12 and Higher Ed educators;
- Develop discipline-specific and age-specific instructional design models;
- Encourage the development and sharing of instructional content; and
- Ensure the infrastructure required to support the deployment and ongoing support of eLearning is in place and available.

The eLearning Consortium would also be responsible for providing administrative and technical support to include:

- The negotiation of required hardware and software purchasing and licensing agreements;
- Development and implementation of deployment strategies; and
- Providing hosting, training, and technical support services as necessary.

The primary components of eLearning encompasses:

- **Course Management Software.** This technology supports the development and delivery of instructional content, assessment and grading, lesson planning, and provides learners with instructional support features to include interactive chat and threaded discussion groups, linkage to reference materials, etc.
- **Content Management Software.** This technology would serve as the basis for the establishment of a Nebraska eLearning Knowledge Repository to facilitate the sharing of educational content. This Knowledge Repository would provide the ability

to store, organize, classify, categorize, control access to, share, retrieve, and present digital content of all forms to include audio, video, graphical, and textual.

- Infrastructure. This includes the network, organizational, administrative, and support resources required to deploy and support eLearning statewide.

Benefits

Establishing a statewide eLearning strategy will provide students and teachers all over Nebraska access to rich instructional resources that are not currently available.

The benefits of a statewide eLearning system would include:

- The sharing of learning objects and other educational content and reference materials that would significantly enrich and deepen the learning experiences offered to Nebraska students, particularly those in the K-12 sector;
- Greater collaboration among educators at all levels;
- The building of extended educational communities of learning and support for ongoing professional development and lifelong learning opportunities;
- Creation of a dual-use training engine for other state agencies, political subdivisions, and adult continuing education;
- Development of diverse instructional and training modules ranging from the simple (how to operate a piece of machinery) to the complex (a web-based course to achieve technician certification).

Current Status

Higher education institutions have made significant investments and deployments of this technology. Survey data collected in 2002 by the staff of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission revealed that eight of 15 Nebraska independent colleges and universities were using some type of course management software. From the same data, all six community colleges, all three state colleges, and all four campuses of the University of Nebraska system were also using some commercial version of the software, ranging from Blackboard to WebCT to Jones eKnowledge. Course usage by students and faculty involvement has reportedly grown by over 10% per year.

In the 2002 data, K-12 schools were just beginning to explore the software using open source or single-district contracts. As of August 2004, a consortium of ESUs (the Nebraska Web-based Staff Development Affiliated Consortium -- NWSDAC) had contracted with CyberLearning Lab's Angel software to replace their 2003-04 contract with Blackboard. NWSDAC reports 15 of 18 Educational Service Units involved with the NWSDAC purchase agreement.

This report should also mention the early development of Class.com, which has continued to offer eLearning services to the present. Class.com has formed strategic partnerships with the Plano ISD eSchool (Texas), Virtual Greenbush AEA (Kansas), and Westside Virtual High School (Nebraska).

Nationally, 14 states have reported the creation of statewide virtual high schools with 25 more states with some type of statewide eLearning involvement.

Future

The ultimate future state of Nebraska's eLearning initiative is largely unknown. Higher education institutions still have potential for additional software penetration with additional seat licenses and also additional options for portals and enterprise versions.

If higher education growth is any indication, Nebraska K-12 schools are on the edge of a tremendous growth period with eLearning. There is unmet needs in rural areas of the State to achieve educational equity of opportunity and eLearning is one tool to assist. Nebraska's 300+ interactive video, distance learning classrooms could immediately adopt course management software for course organization, electronic assessments, and teacher-student and student-student communications.

Nebraska citizens and students would enjoy a much greater access to more flexible lifelong learning opportunities, should a statewide eLearning strategy be adopted. Additional educational opportunity often results in workforce development and enhanced economic vitality. Nebraska's economic engine will be improved through greater retention of high school and college graduates.

Recommended Actions

(NOTE: These recommendations are still subject to change, pending additional advice from those entities that are participating in this strategic initiative.)

A statewide eLearning Consortium to advance the Nebraska eLearning Initiative and improve coordination between K-12, higher education, and adult/continuing education will be established using the following action steps:

A. Organize a series of October 2004 Planning Workshops to bring together participants who have a stake in improving educational and training opportunities for Nebraska citizens through eLearning.

Actions include:

1. Planning Workshop Products:
 - An assessment of current 2004 Course management tool software usage among higher education and K-12 schools;
 - Synthesis of planning workshop contributions to reach a common vision statement for eLearning in Nebraska;
 - Perform a gap analysis between current usage and the future vision of eLearning in Nebraska.
- a. Lead Entity: Staff of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission, working in concert with the NITC Education Council, and staff of the University of Nebraska Computer Services Network.

- b. Timeframe: October 10-29, 2004
- c. Funding: Travel expenses of \$1500.

B. Develop a design document detailing the technology components, standards, costs and administration of a Nebraska eLearning Knowledge Repository for the sharing of educational content.

Actions include:

- 1. Development of an eLearning Knowledge Repository design document.
 - a. Lead Entity: Staff of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission, working in concert with the NITC Education Council, and staff of the University of Nebraska Computer Services Network.
 - b. Timeframe: June 30, 2005
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task.

C. Work with education and staff development professionals to document strategies, techniques and tools used in course management and create a clearinghouse of eLearning best practices and training modules.

Actions include:

- 1. Creation of a clearinghouse of eLearning best practices and training modules.
 - a. Lead Entity: Staff of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission, working in concert with the NITC Education Council, and staff of the University of Nebraska Computer Services Network.
 - b. Timeframe: December 31, 2005
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task.

DRAFT

Date of Last Revision: September 28, 2004

Nebraska Information Technology Commission Strategic Initiatives

Strategic Plan For Enterprise Architecture for State Government

Objectives

Enterprise Architecture is a structured process for deciding what information technology is needed for the enterprise and how to provide information technology services within the organization.

The objectives of enterprise architecture include:

1. Focusing attention on the strategic use of information technology to support the functions of state government (business needs);
2. Providing quality data to those who need it (data sharing);
3. Achieving compatibility among various systems (interoperability);
4. Improving savings and value from expenditures on information technology (efficiency).

Benefits

State government is complex. Its numerous operational units provide a wide range of products and services. Its many functions require relationships with federal agencies, other state agencies, local governments, and private partners. Authority is fragmented among three branches of government, independent agencies and political subdivisions.

Optimizing investments in information technology requires solutions that transcend organizational and jurisdictional boundaries. Enterprise architecture provides disciplined procedures for incorporating enterprise-wide considerations into decisions regarding information technology.

The purpose of Enterprise Architecture is to meet business needs, enhance data sharing, insure interoperability, and improve efficiency. EA accomplishes these objectives by establishing a governance process for EA decisions, documenting business drivers affecting the enterprise, identifying the principles that should guide IT investments, developing technical standards and guidelines, establishing a means for exceptions, and providing enforcement.

Current Status

Some aspects of Enterprise Architecture are in place. In particular, the NITC has a well-established process for developing, reviewing and adopting technical standards and guidelines. The Technical Panel (<http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/tp/>) of the NITC has sponsored several workgroups to prepare elements of a technical architecture. This includes accessibility standards and guidelines, a draft e-government architecture document, network architecture, video standards, and security policies and standards. A copy of existing documents is available at: <http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/index.html>.

Several efforts are also underway that promote integration of information technology systems across the enterprise. These include:

1. Network Nebraska: An initiative sponsored by the NITC for consolidating data and video communications networks across the state.
2. CJIS Advisory Committee: Established by the Nebraska Crime Commission to promote data sharing across all elements of the criminal justice system. (<http://www.nol.org/home/crimecom/>)
3. GIS Steering Committee: Established by the Legislature to coordinate investments in GIS technology and databases. (<http://www.calmit.unl.edu/gis/>)
4. Juvenile Data Sharing Study: A joint effort by the State Government Council and the CJIS Advisory Committee to identify the need and opportunity for data sharing among state and local entities providing services to juveniles.
5. Steering Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect Information Exchanges: State and local agencies are developing solutions to improve data sharing relating to child abuse and neglect investigation and prosecution.

In addition, several agencies are making progress in developing enterprise architecture to guide decisions regarding internal IT systems. HHS' NFOCUS system is the product of an enterprise architecture that now encompasses 26 programs, with linkages to several external systems. The Department of Environmental Quality developed an agency-wide view of information requirements as the foundation for future systems development. The Department of Labor recently completed a "Strategic Technology Architecture Roadmap" before embarking on major changes to its applications. The State Patrol is evaluating its applications and technology in order to achieve better integration and reduce support requirements.

Although important, the sum of these activities falls short of being an enterprise architecture for state government.

In December 2003, the State Government Council (SGC) adopted a strategy for Enterprise Architecture, Shared Services and Standardization. As part of this strategy, the State Government Council will serve as a "committee-of-the-whole" to develop the enterprise architecture. The State Government Council looked at several approaches for enterprise architecture. There was consensus to investigate the tools and resources developed by the National Association of State CIOs (NASCIO), because they were designed for state government and reflect the need for a high level perspective, rather than one that is too detailed. There is also the advantage of getting assistance from

staff at NASCIO and working with other states that are using the NASCIO tools and resources.

Future

One of the tools available from NASCIO is a readiness self-assessment and maturity model. Based on answers to the EA Readiness Assessment, Nebraska state government has at least some of its Business and IT goals defined, and the EA Program is in the planning stages. There is some commitment to the EA process by executives, and the State Government Council (SGC) is serving as the impetus for developing an Enterprise Architecture. However, no budget exists for EA Program development.

Based on the NASCIO self-assessment and maturity model, Nebraska must undertake substantial work in eight categories. There are five levels in the maturity model. Only those steps necessary to achieve Level 3 in each category are reported here.

Administration – Governance Roles & Responsibilities. The purpose of architecture governance is to direct or guide architecture initiatives, ensure that organizational performance aligns with the strategic intent of the business, ensure IT resources are used responsibly and Technology Architecture-related risks are managed appropriately.

Current Level Summary – Based on the responses provided in the EA Assessment, the EA maturity level that most closely identifies your organization’s current state for EA Administration is Level 2 – Repeatable Program. At Level 2, a need for Architecture "Governance" has been identified. The EA Program has begun to develop clear roles and responsibilities. Governance committees are starting to form.

Next Level Summary – The next level is Level 3 – Well-defined Program. At Level 3, Architecture "Governance" committees are established, and have well-defined roles and responsibilities. Authority of the governance committees is also aligned to work together smoothly.

Steps for Progressing to Level 3

- Formalize EA Administration roles and responsibilities
- Formally follow EA deliverables through processes to ensure committees are aligned and working smoothly together
- Verify that all responsibilities, aligned to an individual or group, are being done.
- Develop and conduct educational sessions for the EA Blueprint development teams (Domain committees)

Planning – EA program road map and implementation plan. Architecture Planning ensures the program is managed to assure the goals for implementation are realistic and achievable and the program is kept within scope.

Current Level Summary – Based on the responses provided in the EA Assessment, the EA maturity level that most closely identifies your organization’s current state for EA

Planning is Level 2 – Repeatable Program. At Level 2, the organization has begun to develop a vision for Enterprise Architecture (EA) and has begun to identify EA tasks and resource requirements. The organization has also decided upon a methodology and begun to develop a plan for their EA Program.

Next Level Summary – The next level is Level 3 - Well-defined Program. At Level 3, EA Program plans are well defined and documented, including governance roles & responsibilities, the architecture lifecycle processes, a structured framework and timeline for developing the EA, and financial & staffing resource requirements. EA activities are also carried out according to the defined plan.

Steps for Progressing to Level 3:

- Create EA Program Plan
- Execute EA activities based on defined EA Program Plan
- Update plans based on changes to any of the plan criteria previously mentioned

Framework – processes and templates used for Enterprise Architecture. Architecture Framework consists of the processes, templates and forms used by those documenting the operations and standards of the organization.

Current Level Summary – Based on the responses provided in the EA Assessment, the EA maturity level that most closely identifies your organization’s current state for EA Framework is Level 1 – Informal program. At Level 1, the organization is beginning to understand the need to create processes and templates to capture business drivers and technical standards. However, processes are ad hoc and informal, processes followed may not be consistent. There is no unified architecture process across technologies and lines of business.

Next Level Summary – The next level is Level 2 - Repeatable Program. At Level 2, the basic EA Program is documented. Processes are planned and tracked. The organization is beginning to reuse methods for capturing critical EA information.

Steps for Progressing to Level 3:

- Document the basic EA Program processes and templates
- Begin to track EA Program plan processes
- Track EA processes, actuals against planned
- Encourage reuse of basic EA Program templates
- Formally document Architecture Lifecycle Processes.
- Formally document EA Program Tools (Architecture Lifecycle Templates, Migration Strategy Templates, Classification Criteria Decision Tools)
- Produce Education Materials for the Architecture Lifecycle Processes and Tools
- Conduct Education Sessions for the Architecture Lifecycle Processes and Tools

Blueprint – collection of the actual standards and specifications. Architecture Blueprint refers to the completed documents that are prepared using the Architecture Framework processes, templates and forms. The Blueprint refers to the documented products and standards, together with their detail, classifications, impact statements, and migration strategies.

Current Level Summary – Based on the responses provided in the EA Assessment, the EA maturity level that most closely identifies your organization’s current state for EA Blueprint is Level 0 – No Program. At Level 0, Business functionality is not documented and IT technology standards are not documented.

Next Level Summary – The next level is Level 1 - Informal Program. At Level 1, documentation of business drivers, technical standards, etc. is beginning to happen.

Steps for Progressing to Level 3:

- Research how other organizations capture business drivers and technology standards.
- Informally begin to document Business Drivers
- Informally begin to document Technology Standards
- Identify documented Business Drivers and strategic information
- Identify documented Technology Standards
- Determine ways to capture the various pieces of EA information in a consistent format and storage medium
- Consistently document Technology Standards and Guidelines using the EA Program Tools provided

Communication –education and distribution of EA and Blueprint detail. Communication is the element that ensures standards and processes are established and readily available to team members for reference and use. As an organization changes and programs evolve the continued communication ensures the EA program remains vital and operates optimally.

Current Level Summary – Based on the responses provided in the EA Assessment, the EA maturity level that most closely identifies your organization’s current state for EA Communication is Level 0 – No Program. At Level 0, Senior Management and agencies are not aware of what enterprise architecture is, or the benefits.

Next Level Summary – The next level is Level 1 - Informal Program. At Level 1, the need to create greater awareness about EA has been identified.

Steps for Progressing to Level 3:

- Begin to talk to Senior Management groups regarding the benefits of Enterprise Architecture
- Create Enterprise Architecture Marketing Materials
- Conduct an Enterprise Architecture Marketing Campaign to Senior Management and Legislators
- Prepare and conduct workshops on sharing ideas, standards, and technology configuration specifications
- Share EA Blueprint information captured in reusable formats
- Develop a formal Communication process to ensure the EA Program is communicated and known throughout the organization
- Conduct EA Senior EA presentation showing actual results from EA Program
- Develop and conduct training sessions to educate committee members on the EA roles and responsibilities, processes and templates
- EA Blueprint is available to all stakeholders for analysis and review
- EA Variances are communicated out to all stakeholders

Compliance – adherence to published standards, processes and other EA elements, and the processes to document and track variances from those standards. Compliance must be reviewed periodically to be sure the business and IT programs and services are operating effectively.

Current Level Summary – Based on the responses provided in the EA Assessment, the EA maturity level that most closely identifies your organization’s current state for EA Compliance is Level 0 – No Program. At Level 0, no compliance process exists within the organization.

Next Level Summary – The next level is Level 1 - Informal Program. At Level 1, the need for compliance to standards has been identified.

Steps for Progressing to Level 3:

- On a "target action" list, identify the need to comply with the developed guidelines, standards and legislation
- Identify the various ways that compliance is currently accomplished within your organization and document them.
- Document a consistent compliance process to ensure that changes in the enterprise are in line with the documented guidelines, standards, and legislation.
- Choose a pilot project to take through the compliance process. Ensure that the compliance process takes into account all of the steps required to ensure compliance and brings benefit to the team seeking information from the EA Program
- Observe the development of a business case to seek a variance from the guidelines, standards, and legislation.
- Document issues that came up regarding the development process and/or difficulties encountered
- Fully integrate the EA compliance process with the other EA Program Architecture Lifecycle Processes to ensure interoperability of the EA Program overall
- To keep the EA Blueprint vital, ensure that the various help requests and variances are tracked and feed into the Architecture Vitality processes
- Use the information documented during the observation of the Business Case development process to further define and improve the process
- Provide a business case template to aid in the development of consistent business cases across the enterprise

Integration – touch-points of management processes to the EA. Integration addresses the ability of the various entities (internal or external to the organization) to coordinate their efforts to the greatest benefit of the organization. This is a key factor, as great efficiencies are gained by identifying similar functions or operations, both inside and outside of an organization.

Current Level Summary – Based on the responses provided in the EA Assessment, the EA maturity level that most closely identifies your organization’s current state for EA Integration is Level 1 – Informal program. At Level 1, the need for integration to the EA Program Framework (Architecture Lifecycle Processes) has been identified. The various

touch-points between the Management Processes and the EA Program Framework have been mapped, however, no details exists to how the integration will work. Projects and purchases may be costly because they are done in isolation.

Next Level Summary – The next level is Level 2 - Repeatable Program. At Level 2, the organization has begun to identify common Business and system functions, which allows touch-points to be identified earlier in the project development life cycle.

Steps for Progressing to Level 3:

- Determine the benefits that the EA Program can bring to the other Management Processes
- Meet with the owners/stakeholders of other Management Processes. Talk to them about the benefits that can be received by integrating various processes
- Brainstorm various options for integrating their Management Processes with the EA Program Framework
- Determine next steps to help the integration to move forward
- Document the EA Program integration points:
- The documented integration points should be completed for all of the following Management Processes that exist in your organization, including strategic planning, capital planning, project management, change management, procurement, and budgeting.
- Make Architecture Compliance Review part of the project methodology

Involvement – support of the EA Program throughout the organization. Involvement must be part of an EA Program. Without the support of managers and employees who are expected to utilize and follow the defined process, the program is sure to fail.

Current Level Summary – Based on the responses provided in the EA Assessment, the EA maturity level that most closely identifies your organization’s current state for EA Involvement is Level 0 – No Program. At Level 0, there is no program in place for Enterprise Architecture awareness. Several independent groups or individuals will be typically working to solve a single issue.

Next Level Summary – The next level is Level 1 - Informal Program. At Level 1 the organization has identified a need to make staff throughout the enterprise aware of the benefits and concepts of Enterprise Architecture.

Steps for Progressing to Level 3:

- Document the advantages of having Enterprise Architecture that are specific to your organization. If you have EA benefit statements or charters already developed, these can help in documenting the advantages.
- In the document, discuss the concept that all organizations have an architecture, however, having a successful, Enterprise Architecture is a matter of having the details of that Architecture explicitly defined and documented, rather than implicitly done based on everyone’s Agencyal inclinations or understanding
- Speak to various management groups throughout the organization about the concepts of EA.
- Set-up web site to increase understanding of EA and solicit involvement
- As EA roles and responsibilities are identified, solicit volunteers and choose individuals to assist in the EA Program.

- Continue to provide the EA Blueprint information to the various organizational groups within your enterprise. Communicate to the members of these groups the benefits of having the EA Blueprint information for the critical decision-making process
- Continue to involve additional organizational individuals/groups in the EA roles and responsibilities. As people get involved they become proponents of the program

Recommended Actions

(NOTE: These recommendations are still subject to change, pending additional advice from those entities that are participating in this strategic initiative.)

The NASCIO methodology recognizes that developing Enterprise Architecture is a gradual, iterative process. Each version of the Enterprise Architecture builds on previous work. This section sets forth the detailed work plan for the next 6 months. Timeframes reflect high-level estimates without perfect knowledge of the tasks to be accomplished or the resources that will be available.

Actions Include:

1. Governance and Planning
 - a. Lead Entity: CIO
 - b. Tasks and Timeframes:
 - i. Prepare draft roles and responsibilities for EA (September 16, 2004)
 - ii. Prepare draft EA Program Plan (September 16, 2004)
 - iii. Prepare draft changes to SGC Charter, if necessary (October 2004)
 - iv. Publish version 1.0 of the EA (January 31, 2004)
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task
2. Compliance Plan
 - a. Lead Entity: CIO
 - b. Tasks and Timeframes:
 - i. Document current compliance process (September 16, 2004)
 - ii. Prepare draft of proposed changes to compliance process (October 2004)
 - iii. Prepare draft of process and criteria for justifying a variance to the EA (October 31, 2004)
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task
3. Integration Plan
 - a. Lead Entity: CIO
 - b. Tasks and Timeframes:
 - i. Prepare draft documentation of relationship of EA to project management (November 30, 2004)
 - ii. Prepare draft documentation of relationship of EA to strategic planning and budgeting (December 31, 2004)

- c. Funding: No funding required for this task
- 4. Technical Architecture Framework
 - a. Lead Entity: CIO
 - b. Tasks and Timeframes:
 - i. Document EA program process and templates (December 31, 2004)
 - ii. Document Architecture Lifecycle Process (December 31, 2004)
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task
- 5. Technical Architecture Blueprint
 - a. Lead Entity: CIO
 - b. Tasks and Timeframes:
 - i. Research and document business drivers (December 31, 2004)
 - ii. Research and document existing technical standards (target date?)
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task
- 6. Enterprise licensing
 - a. Lead Entity: Tom Conroy
 - b. Tasks and Timeframes:
 - i. Solicit enterprise pricing for anti-virus software (August 31, 2004)
 - ii. Enter into enterprise contracts with at least three additional vendors by June 30, 2005.
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task
- 7. Shared services
 - a. Lead Entity: TBD
 - b. Tasks and Timeframes:
 - i. Research opportunities for shared services, including criteria for deciding whether a service should be centralized or distributed (target date?)
 - ii. Prepare an inventory of existing shared services (target date?)
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task

Nebraska Information Technology Commission Strategic Initiatives

Strategic Plan For E-Government

Objectives

In a memo to all agencies dated November 19, 2003 (<http://www.cio.state.ne.us/e-gov/Automation.pdf>), the Governor identified four management principles for e-government:

1. It should be easy for citizens and businesses to find information regarding government;
2. The administrative burden of complying with government requirements should be as minimal as possible;
3. Self-service should be an option, if at all feasible; and
4. Government should present an integrated view of government information and services.

E-government is a continuous process of using technology to serve citizens and improve agency operations. Technology creates new opportunities for major change, including self-service, integration of information and services, and elimination of time, distance and availability of staff as constraint to providing information and services. An enterprise approach and cooperation of multiple jurisdictions are critical to achieving the goals of e-government, in order to integrate information and services and allow the easy exchange of information.

Benefits

The primary benefits of e-government are:

1. Improved services for citizens and businesses.
2. Increased efficiency and effectiveness for agencies.

Current Status

Where we are...

Since the adoption of the first *E-government Strategic Plan* in 2000, state agencies have continued to make progress toward the vision of having Nebraska government be open

for business from any place and at any time through the use of e-government. The two major sources of this progress have been, first, from individual and collaborative agency initiatives and second, from enhancements to the state's Web portal, Nebrask@ Online (NOL). The following is a look at where we are in development of e-government services in state government. It is not intended to be a comprehensive list of all efforts but a general overview of the progress made since the first adoption of a strategic plan.

Looking at improvements in the state's Web portal, Nebrask@ Online, is a good starting point for this review because the portal is the front door for e-government in Nebraska. In 2000 the portal was redesigned to better serve citizens and businesses. The redesigned site presents information in categories, which reflected how users would most likely look for information and services. The idea behind the redesign was that users should be able to find the information they were seeking without having to know which specific agency or division of state government was responsible for that information or service. The goal was to get the user to the information they needed within two mouse clicks. The redesigned site was nationally recognized in 2001, 2002, and 2004 as a finalist in the "Best of the Web" competition, meaning the state's Web portal was in the top ten of state Web portals.

Building on the theme of categorizing information by topic, the next major revision to Nebrask@ Online involved creating "sub-portals" or "second-level portals." Each sub-portal provides a specific user group with information and value-added services of interest to that group. Sub-portals have been created for the following areas: business, citizen, education, and state employees.

Nebraska@ Online for Business was the first operational sub-portal, launched in May 2002. The site offers a number of features of value to the business community, two of which are a database of business forms and a customizable portfolio. The database contains information and links to more than 1200 state government forms that are used to regulate or otherwise interact with businesses. This database can be searched in a variety of ways, and can retrieve information without regard for the responsible agency. In this way, the user does not have to be familiar with which agency handles a form in order to obtain the information. An upgrade to Nebrask@ Online for Business and the forms inventory began in August 2004.

The other sub-portals -- Nebrask@ Online for Education, Nebrask@ Online for Citizens, and Nebrask@ Online for State Employees -- each provide the user group with an enhanced presentation and delivery of e-government information and services.

NOL has also implemented a "Payment Portal." This portal provides an enterprise approach to payment processing for e-government services. All online services can use a single payment portal to collect funds associated with the various e-government services provided. The portal will eliminate the need to recreate a payment system for each online application. The payment portal can process credit card, debit card or electronic check payments.

In addition to work on the state portal and sub-portals, NOL has developed and launched several specific e-government applications, including interactive electrical permits; water well registrations, more than 80 online professional license renewals for nine different agencies; and tax filing applications for income, sales and withholding taxes. Work is

underway on a one-stop business registration system that will provide a single Web interface for several agency registration processes.

Since publication of the first e-government strategic plan, state agencies have added considerable content and many interactive services to their websites. A few examples include:

- Game and Parks Commission – Online campground and lodging reservations (<http://www.ngpc.state.ne.us/parks/permits/reserve.asp>)
- Department of Revenue – Tax Forms and online tax filing options such as Individual Income Tax forms 1040NS, 1040N; Sales and Use Tax Form 10; and the 941N for withholding payments (<http://www.revenue.state.ne.us/electron/e-file.htm>)
- Department of Labor – UIConnect for unemployment insurance taxes (<http://www.dol.state.ne.us/>)
- Public Employees Retirement System – Access to Pension-Related Information (<http://www.npers.ne.gov/home.jsp>)
- State Treasurer – Child Support Website (<https://www.nebraskachildsupport.state.ne.us/>)
- Nebraska Supreme Court – Court Records Retrieval System
- Nebraska Workers’ Compensation Court - Claims Administrator’s Extranet First Report of Injury Search Application

This background information is intended to show the basic direction of e-government activities since 2000. A more complete listing of e-government services is available at: <http://www.state.ne.us/egov.html>.

Digital State Survey

One measure of the progress we have made in implementing e-government is to look to national reports on e-government. The Center for Digital Government has conducted a detailed survey of digital government in all 50 states, called the “Digital State Survey.”¹ Looking at how Nebraska has scored provides a tool for measuring our progress. However, as with all surveys, there are elements of subjectivity in this survey -- what is deemed an important aspect of e-government for those conducting the survey may not necessarily align with our focus in Nebraska. With that note, here is table showing how Nebraska has scored:

Digital State Survey Results				
Category	2000 Ranking	2001 Ranking	2002 Ranking	2004 Ranking
Electronic Commerce / Business Regulation	28	25	Unranked (>25 th)	Not Available
Taxation / Revenue	29	9 (tie)	1 (tied)	Not Available
Law Enforcement / Courts	12	Unranked (> 25 th)	Unranked (> 25 th)	Not Available
Social Services	9	5 (tie)	7 (tie)	Not Available
Digital Democracy	13	3	17	Not Available
Management / Admin.	10	22	Unranked (>25 th)	Not Available
Education	K-12: 31st Higher Ed: 17th	20	14 (tied)	Not Available
GIS / Transportation	(New category in 2001)	Unranked (> 25 th)	21 (tied)	Not Available
Aggregate Ranking	14 th	17 th	Unranked (>25 th)	22

¹ <http://www.centerdigitalgov.com/>

To move into the top ten, Nebraska must accomplish the following:

- Prepare a comprehensive strategy for online licensing;
- Develop an online business registration system;
- Provide online criminal history background checks;
- Establish a marketing strategy to improve adoption rates;
- Require testing and management tools for accessibility;
- Require online privacy statements;
- Provide an online system where constituents can request services, report problems, complain about services, and complete citizen satisfaction surveys about state services;
- Develop and implement an enterprise architecture for information technology;
- Provide an enterprise approach for knowledge resource management (including content management, business process automation, directory services, registries and repositories, and digital archive), and
- Provide an enterprise approach to security services.

Future

Where we are going...

This plan is the State Government Council's communication of where Nebraska state government needs to direct its efforts to achieve the greatest benefits from e-government. The vision and goals for e-government are:

Vision: The State of Nebraska will be open for business from any place and at any time through the use of e-government.

Goal 1: Government-to-Citizen and Government-to-Business
Anyone needing to do business with state government will be able to go to the state's Web site, easily find the information or service they need, and if they desire, complete all appropriate transactions electronically.

Goal 2: Government-to-Government
State agencies will improve services and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of government operations through collaboration, communication, and data sharing between government agencies at all levels.

Goal 3: Government-to-Employee and Internal Operations
Agencies will examine internal operations to determine cost-effective e-government applications and solutions. The purpose of these efforts is to improve efficiency and effectiveness by replacing manual operations with automated techniques. Automating internal operations is often a prerequisite for improving public access to information and services.

How citizens and businesses use e-government.

These goals are consistent with the expectations of citizens and businesses. A recent survey found that approximately 71 million Americans had sought information from a

government Web site. This same survey also showed that 82% of Internet users “expect” to get the information or service they need from the agency’s Web site.²

When businesses were surveyed about which activities they would like to perform online, 43% reported they would like to use the Internet to obtain or renew professional licenses and 39% wanted access to one-stop shopping to apply for all new business licenses and permits. Other services sought by business users, as reported by the survey, included: 38% access to criminal history background checks; 36% apply for a business permit; 34% obtain a limited criminal history report. Businesses cited the benefits of participating in e-government as: speed (51%); convenience - no line (43%); and better hours (22%).³

Citizens also reported improved interactions with government when using government Internet sites. Overall, 60% of government Web site users say such sites had improved their interaction with at least one level of government, and 45% said it had improved the way they interact with state government.⁴

The following table shows what government site users do at agency Web sites⁵:

What government site users do at agency Web sites	
<i>The percentage of those who use government Web sites who have ever done these activities at government sites...</i>	
Get tourism and recreational information	77%
Do research for work or school	70%
Download government forms	63%
Find out what services a government agency provides	63%
Seek information about a public policy or issue of interest to you	62%
Get advice or information about a health or safety issue	49%
Get information about potential business opportunities relevant to you or your place of employment	34%
Send comments about an issue to a government official	34%
Get information or apply for a government job	24%
Get information about elections, such as where to vote	22%
Get information that helped you decide how to vote in an election	21%
Get information about a lottery	21%
Get information about or apply for government benefits	20%
File your taxes	16%
Renew a driver's license or auto registration	12%
Renew a professional license	7%
Get a fishing, hunting or other recreational license	4%
Pay a fine	2%

Source: Pew Internet & American Life Project Government Web Site Survey, September 5-27, 2001. N=815. Margin of error is ±4%.

² Horrigan, J., *Counting on the Internet*, Pew Internet & American Life Project, <http://www.pewinternet.org/>, December 29, 2002

³ *Benchmarking the eGovernment Revolution*, Momentum Research Group of Cunningham Communications (Commissioned by NIC), July 26, 2000.

⁴ Larsen, E., *The rise of the e-citizen*, Pew Internet & American Life Project, <http://www.pewinternet.org/>, April 3, 2002.

⁵ Ibid.

Best practices in other states.

As part of the Digital State Survey, the Center for Digital Government also looks at “best practices” in other states. The following is a list of some of these e-government best practices:

<u>URL</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Category</u>
http://www.michigan.gov/doingbusiness	Michigan Doing Business with the State (e-procurement system)	Architecture
http://www.oit.state.pa.us/oaioit/site/default.asp	Pennsylvania PA-Dynamic Site Framework (web content management tool)	Architecture
http://www.access.wa.gov	Washington Ask George (user friendly search tool)	Architecture
http://www.truckingks.org	Kansas E-Truck Stop (online access for motor carriers)	Business Portal
http://www.choosemaryland.org	Maryland ChooseMaryland.org (business portal and site selection tool)	Business Portal
http://www.etides.state.pa.us/	Pennsylvania E-TIDES (common tax filing system for Revenue and Labor)	Business Portal
http://www.paopen4business.state.pa.us/	Pennsylvania Open for Business (online access for businesses)	Business Portal
http://www.townhall.state.va.us	Virginia Regulatory Town Hall (tracking rules and regulations)	Business Portal
http://www.sbe.state.va.us	Virginia Absentee Ballot Tracking	Citizen Portal
http://www.sots.state.ct.us/	Connecticut Campaign Finance Information System (electronic campaign filing system)	Citizens Portal
http://www.cyberdriveIllinois.com	Illinois Online Services for Motorists (central access to all MV-related services)	Citizens Portal
http://www.state.in.us/apps/lisa/session/billwatch/	Indiana BillWatch (bill tracking and e-mail updates)	Citizens Portal
http://legis.state.sd.us/mylrc/index.cfm	South Dakota My Legislative Research (customized bill tracking and e-mail notification)	Citizens Portal
http://www.coloradomentor.org/	Colorado Mentor Program (online resources for university admissions)	Education Portal
http://www.umuc.edu/	University of Maryland University College (online education model)	Education Portal
http://www.gis.state.ar.us/defaultIE.htm	Arkansas GeoStar (Internet-based GIS data clearinghouse)	GIS
http://www.sccgis.state.or.us/	Oregon Geospatial Data Clearinghouse	GIS
http://www.eva.state.va.us/	Virginia eVA (procurement system for state and local government)	Procurement
http://www.wa.gov/dis/academy/index.htm	Washington Digital Government Applications Academy	Training

Recommended Actions

(NOTE: These recommendations are still subject to change, pending additional advice from those entities that are participating in this strategic initiative.)

Goal 1: Government-to-Citizen and Government-to-Business

Citizen Portal Enhancements

The citizen portal, Nebrask@ Online for Citizens (<http://www.nebraska.gov/citizen/>), was launched in 2003. The following are specific actions and recommendations for value-added enhancements to this portal.

- 1.1 Work with the Secretary of State’s Office to provide enhancements to election related information and services.
 - a. Lead Entity: Nebrask@ Online Manager (“NOL”) in cooperation with the Secretary of State’s Office
 - b. Timeframe: TBD
 - c. Funding: Secretary of State / NOL

- 1.2 Work with the Accountability and Disclosure Commission to provide for secure online filings and improved access to information.
 - a. Lead Entity: NOL (in cooperation with the Accountability and Disclosure Commission)
 - b. Timeframe: January 31, 2005
 - c. Funding: State Records Board Grant
- 1.3 Work with the Legislature to provide additional tools to track legislative information. The Nebrask@ Online Manager is developing additional features, including the ability to track multiple bills from one location and the use of e-mail "push" technology.
 - a. Lead Entity: NOL (in cooperation with the Legislature Council)
 - b. Timeframe: November 1, 2004
 - c. Funding: State Records Board Grant
- 1.4 Work with the Department of Motor Vehicles to provide for online vehicle registration and drivers license renewal. DMV is in the process of implementing two systems -- insured motorists database and digital drivers license system -- which will allow for the future deployment of these online services.
 - a. Lead Entity: Department of Motor Vehicles
 - b. Timeframe: TBD
 - c. Funding: DMV
- 1.5 Work with the Nebrask@ Online Manager and county officials to provide the means for online payment of property taxes and other local fees.
 - a. Lead Entity: NOL (in cooperation with county governments)
 - b. Target Completion Date: TBD
 - c. Funding: NOL (Reinvested Revenue)
- 1.6 Prepare a comprehensive strategy for online licensing of regulated professionals.
 - a. Lead Entity: Office of the CIO
 - b. Target Completion Date: December 31, 2004
 - c. Funding: NOL (Reinvested Revenue)

Business Portal Enhancements

The business portal, Nebrask@ Online for Business (<http://www.nebraska.gov/business/>), was launched in May 2002. The following are specific actions and recommendations for value-added enhancements to this portal.

- 1.7 Working with the various agencies involved in business registration -- including the Secretary of State, Department of Revenue, and Department of Labor -- create an online system for business registration.
 - a. Lead Entity: Office of the CIO
 - b. Timeframe: TBD (Pending requirements analysis by NOL)
 - c. Funding: NOL (Reinvested Revenue)
- 1.8 Prepare a report on the barriers and options for providing online access to certain, limited, criminal history information.
 - a. Lead Entity: Office of the CIO (in cooperation with the Nebraska State Patrol)
 - b. Timeframe: May 31, 2005

- c. Funding: NOL No funding needed for this analysis
- 1.9 Develop an online application for use by businesses attempting to find a suitable site for business development.
- a. Lead Entity: Office of the CIO
 - b. Timeframe: TBD (Pending requirements analysis by NOL)
 - c. Funding: State Records Board Grant or NOL (Reinvested or Enhanced Revenue)
- 1.10 Improve the business forms database maintained by NOL and enhance the search capabilities.
- a. Lead Entity: NOL and Office of the CIO
 - b. Timeframe: October 31, 2004
 - c. Funding: State Records Board Grant

Education Portal

The Education Portal (<http://www.nebraska.gov/education/>) first became available to the general public in February 2003. The following are specific actions and recommendations for value-added enhancements.

- 1.11 Under sponsorship of the Education Council of the NTIC, The Nebrask@ Online Manager will work with the Education Council educational institutions to provide enhancements to the Education Portal, including but not limited to:
- Information Technology Training Calendar;
 - Searchable database of educational courses, degrees, and programs;
 - Statewide application for admission to higher education institutions.
- a. Lead Entity: Office of the CIO / Education Council
 - b. Timeframe: TBD
 - c. Funding: State Records Board Grant
- 1.12 The Department of Education is developing online teacher/administrator certification.
- a. Lead Entity: Department of Education
 - b. Timeframe: November 2004
 - c. Funding: NDE

Goal 2: Government-to-Government

- 2.1 Develop strategies to address the following government-to-government activities:
- Intergovernmental Cooperation Groups. Expand upon current intergovernmental cooperative efforts like the CJIS Advisory Committee and GIS Steering Committee; and develop new cooperative groups for those agencies that have specific, shared interests.
 - Integration of Government Information and Services. Develop strategies for using Internet technologies to provide integrated access to information and services to citizens, businesses, employees, and other governmental entities.
 - Local Government Portal. Provide a one-stop Web site for information and services used by local governments.

- Forms Automation. Work with state agencies and political subdivisions to identify and prioritize opportunities for automating forms that local government uses to interact with state government.
- a. Lead Entity: State Government Council
 - b. Timeframe: July 2005
 - c. Funding: None

Goal 3: Government-to-Employee and Internal Operations

- 3.1 State Employee Portal Enhancements. The State Government Council will identify specific improvements and value-added services to be incorporated into the state employee portal, [Nebraska@ Online for State Employees](mailto:Nebraska@OnlineforStateEmployees) (www.nebraska.gov/employee/).
- a. Lead Entity: State Government Council
 - b. Timeframe: July 2005
 - c. Funding: None

Other Actions and Recommendations

- 4.1 Develop a marketing strategy to increase public awareness and the use of e-government services.
- a. Lead Entity: NOL
 - b. Timeframe: TBD
 - c. Funding: NOL (Reinvested Revenue)
- 4.2 Prepare draft standards for all agency home pages to include privacy and security statements.
- a. Lead Entity: Webmasters Work Group
 - b. Timeframe: December 2004
 - c. Funding: None
- 4.3 The SGC will work with other entities to investigate ways of providing authentication, especially for first time encounters with users.
- a. Lead Entity: Office of the CIO
 - b. Timeframe: December 2004
 - c. Funding: TBD

Nebraska Information Technology Commission Strategic Initiatives

Strategic Plan For Security and Business Resumption

Objectives

This initiative will define and clarify policies, standards and guidelines, and responsibilities related to the protection of the state's information technology resources. Information security and business resumption will serve statutory goals pertaining to government operations and public records. These include:

1. Insure continuity of government operations (Article III, Section 29 of the Nebraska Constitution; Nebraska Revised Statutes Sections 28-901 and 84-1201);
2. Protect safety and integrity of public records (Nebraska Revised Sections 28-911, 29-2391, and 84-1201);
3. Prevent unauthorized access to public records (Nebraska Revised Statutes Sections 29-319, 81-1117.02, and 84-712.02);
4. Insure proper use of communications facilities (Nebraska Revised Statutes Section 81-1117.02); and
5. Protect privacy of citizens (Nebraska Revised Statutes Section 84, Article 7).

Information security refers to policies and procedures that are aimed at preventing problems that would threaten the safety and integrity of information resources. Business resumption refer to plans and activities aimed at responding to an event in a manner that mitigates the severity of problems and accelerates recovery.

Benefits

A strategy for security and business resumption of information technology systems is essential for meeting the statutory objectives listed above. In addition, there are several federal laws and regulations regarding privacy and security of information. These include HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act), IT Requirements for Public Health Preparedness and Response for Bioterrorism (Center for Disease Control), Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA), Graham-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA), and the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Some of the federal laws carry substantial penalties. In particular, HIPAA imposes civil penalties of up to \$25,000 per person, per year, per standard as well as criminal penalties from \$50,000 and one year in prison to \$250,000 and 10 years in prison (when malice, commercial advantage and personal gain are involved).

Security is also important for protecting critical systems that impact large numbers of people in the state. A few examples include:

- Unemployment assistance (\$2.2 million paid out per week to 18,000 people)
- Child support (\$4.4 million paid per week to 20,000 recipients)
- Medicaid claims (156,000 claims per week; \$21.4 million payments per week)
- NFOCUS payments for multiple human services programs (\$26 million paid each month for 185,000 cases)
- State accounting and payroll system
- Law enforcement
- Tax collection
- Homeland Security functions

The FBI conducts an annual survey of computer security issues affecting U.S. corporations, government agencies, financial institutions, medical institutions, and universities. The 2004 CSI/FBI Computer Crime and Security Survey included the following findings:

- 79% of survey participants reported one or more security incidents;
- 78% reported virus attacks;
- 59% reported insider abuse of Net access;
- 49% reported laptop/mobile theft;
- 39% reported system penetration;
- 37% reported unauthorized access to information;
- 15% reported abuse of wireless networks;
- 10% reported misuse of public web applications, and
- 7% reported web site defacement.

The 2004 survey is available at: http://i.cmpnet.com/gocsi/db_area/pdfs/fbi/FBI2004.pdf.

An additional justification for attention to computer security issues is the National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace, published by the Department of Homeland Security in February 2003. One of the priorities of the national cyberstrategy is "Securing Governments' Cyberspace." The foundation for the federal government's cybersecurity includes:

- Assigning clear and unambiguous authority and responsibility for security priorities;
- Holding officials accountable for fulfilling those responsibilities, and
- Integrating security requirements into budget and capital planning processes.

The national cyberstrategy encourages state and local governments to "establish IT security programs for their departments and agencies, including awareness, audits, and standards; and to participate in the established ISACs (Information Sharing and Analysis Centers) with similar governments."

Adequate security is also essential to expansion of e-government. Surveys show that concerns about security is one reason that the public is cautious about using on-line services, especially for conducting financial transactions or providing personal information.

Current Status

Every version of the Statewide Technology Plan of the NITC has included one or more action items pertaining to security for information technology systems. Past achievements include:

- Establishing the Security Work Group, with broad representation from state government and education sectors, to provide a forum for sharing information and developing standards and guidelines. Agendas and minutes are located at: <http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/tp/workgroups/security/index.htm>.
- Adopting a comprehensive set of security policies in January 2001 by the NITC. These policies include: Information Security Management, Access Control, Disaster Recovery, Education, Training and Awareness, Individual Use, Network Security, and Security Breaches and Incident Reporting.
- Publishing three security handbooks tailored to security officers, IS technical staff, and the general user.
- Offering training on the use of the security handbooks.
- Developing detailed information on:
 - Incident Response and Reporting Procedures;
 - Disaster Recovery Planning Procedures;
 - Wireless Local Area Network Guidelines;
 - Remote Access Guidelines.
- Sponsoring a Security Awareness Day (July 15, 2002).

All NITC policies, handbooks, procedures and guidelines are available at: <http://www.nitc.state.ne.us/standards/index.html> (under Security Architecture).

In 2002, the Nebraska Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) added a provision to the State Emergency Operations Plan that requires “Each state agency and local government (to develop) a continuity of operations plan and a disaster plan for information technology.” In 2003, NEMA awarded \$75,000 to the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) for a “Continuity of Operations Study”. DAS has contracted with a company specializing in developing business continuity plans. The outcome will be a complete business continuity plan for all divisions of DAS. It will also provide a template that can be used for other agencies. By including a ‘train-the-trainer’ concept as well as involving multiple agencies in the project, DAS intends to encourage development of business continuity plans in all agencies.

The NITC has also funded two security audits. In March 2004, Omnitech conducted a limited security assessment of the state’s network. The external vulnerability scan identified a total of 2,720 potential vulnerabilities with the following breakdown: 91 high-risk, 640 medium risk, and 1,989 low risk. Twelve agencies had one or more high-risk vulnerabilities. Agencies are in the process of evaluating the assessments and what steps they need to take. Not all of the potential vulnerabilities can or should be removed but all of the high and medium risk vulnerabilities will be accounted for by the agency responsible for the host that is vulnerable. In 2003, the results were 3,262 potential vulnerabilities (136 high risk, 1,182 medium risk, and 1,944 low risk). Seventeen agencies last year had one or more high-risk vulnerabilities.

These summary statistics indicate some progress in reducing the number of potential vulnerabilities, but the March 2004 results underscore the need for more attention on securing our information assets. These potential vulnerabilities may expose state government to the risk of disruption of services, legal liability, and financial loss.

Several agencies have undertaken special projects and initiatives to improve security of information technology systems. These include:

- Department of Administrative Services
 - Implemented layered security and firewall management of the state's network;
 - Developed directory services capability for better authentication and identity management;
 - Updating the disaster recovery plan for Information Management Services Division;
 - Distributing security notices from the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center to agency security contacts.
- Health and Human Services
 - Designated a security officer for information technology;
 - Implemented HIPAA Privacy and Security regulations;
 - Developing agency security policies and procedures;
- Department of Roads
 - Designated a security officer for information technology;
 - Updating the disaster recovery plan for information technology services;
 - Developing agency security policies and procedures.
- University of Nebraska
 - In collaboration with DAS-IMServices, NU is developing a shared, fast recovery capability, through mutual assistance of physically distant data centers. Fiber optic cable has been installed between the State and University.
 - Hired a University Information Security Officer
 - Work is progressing on the design and implementation of a Directory Service / Identity Management System.
 - Disaster recovery plan is going through major revisions to update and incorporate new options.
 - UN has implemented various firewalls in locations where it is needed.
 - Implemented a University-wide security focus group to share information, patch management, awareness training, incident reporting, and other educational opportunities.
 - University-wide licensing for McAfee Anti-Virus Software
 - Implemented various federally mandated regulations (HIPAA, GLBA, FERPA).
- Multiple Agencies
 - Implementing recommendations stemming from the March 2004 Network Perimeter Security Sweep.

Future

Security is a continuous effort to manage the risk to information systems. The expense of security safeguards must be cost effective and commensurate with the value of the

assets being protected. Security must be balanced against other business needs, such as providing public access or remote access to information.

The previous section demonstrates the progress that is being made. Further improvement in security and disaster recovery is needed in several areas:

- Monitor and reduce the number of vulnerabilities of computer systems;
- Provide better patch management, including enforcement of patch management policies;
- Promote survivability of systems as a security strategy;
- Demonstrate the ability to recovery critical computer systems following a disaster, including table top exercises of disaster recovery plans;
- Improve awareness on the part of users regarding security policies and sound security practices;
- Insure adequate security for wireless systems through encryption capabilities and other means;
- Deploy intrusion detection and protection technologies to protect critical infrastructure;
- Provide redundant services for critical infrastructure such as additional Internet access points;
- Plan for additional infrastructure to extend the distances for shared disaster recovery facilities.

Finding cost effective and workable solutions to these problems is essential to a good security program for state government.

Recommended Actions

(NOTE: These recommendations are still subject to change, pending additional advice from those entities that are participating in this strategic initiative.)

SECURITY

A. Conduct annual independent security audits

In the latest computer crime survey by the FBI, 82 percent of respondents indicated that their organizations conduct security audits. Multiple federal programs require periodic computer security audits, including HIPAA, HAVA, and Bioterrorism grants from the Center for Disease Control. Computer security audits are a widely accepted best practice across the public and private sector.

Actions include:

1. Request funding for the CIO to contract for security audits.
 - a. Lead Entity: CIO
 - b. Timeframe: September 1, 2004
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task
2. Investigate opportunities for aggregating efforts of several state agencies that face federal requirements for security audits.
 - a. Lead Entity: CIO

- b. Timeframe: November 1, 2004 (and on-going)
- c. Funding: No funding required for this task
- 3. Prepare RFP and Scope of Work
 - a. Lead Entity: CIO (with assistance from Security Work Group)
 - b. Timeframe: January 31, 2005
 - c. Funding: If technical assistance is required for preparing the RFP, the cost will be paid either from the NITC grant or the budget of the Office of the CIO.
- 4. Conduct 2005 Security Audit
 - a. Lead Entity: CIO
 - b. Timeframe: April 30, 2005
 - c. Funding: A grant application is pending before the NITC. The CIO is requesting funding for annual security audits as part of the FY2006 / FY2007 budget request.

B. Implement centralized directory services

An analysis of security risks identified the need for an Enterprise Directory that provides identity management, single sign on, and role-based/policy-based authorization. In response to this need, IMServices is now implementing a directory services system that will be available to all agencies. Under the direction of the CIO and the NITC, a Work Group was established to make recommendations regarding business rules, polices and procedures for implementation. The system will provide single (or reduced) sign-on using role based authentication and authorization

Actions include:

- 1) Establish an authentication standard to be submitted to the NITC to seek approval by the March 2005 meeting
 - a) Propose standard to State Government Council
 - Lead Entity: IMServices
 - Timeframe: September 16, 2004 meeting
 - Funding: No funding required for this task
 - b) Propose standard to NITC Technical Panel
 - Lead Entity: IMServices
 - Timeframe: December 14, 2004 meeting
 - Funding: No funding required for this task
- 2) Content Management offerings to customers
 - a) Implement the Content Management structure for all agencies -
 - Lead Entity: IMServices
 - Timeframe: March 31, 2005
 - Funding: IMServices
- 3) Two-factor authentication
 - a) Propose standard to NITC Directory Workgroup
 - Lead Entity: IMServices
 - Timeframe: September 30, 2004 meeting
 - Funding: No funding required for this task
 - b) Propose standard to SGC
 - Lead Entity: IMServices

- Timeframe: December 2004 meeting
 - Funding: No funding required for this task
- 4) Pilot single sign-on
- a) Provide Web-Based Single sign-on (WSSO) guideline to any client/application that desires it.
 - Lead Entity: IMServices
 - Timeframe: September 30, 2004
 - Funding: IMServices

C. Implement incident reporting requirements

Very few agencies are complying with the NITC's incident reporting requirements. Centralized reporting serves the goal of increasing awareness of vulnerabilities and threats to state government as a whole. In particular, centralized reporting is necessary to discern patterns, identify areas of vulnerability, allocate resources, and develop statewide solutions. Centralized reporting does not substitute for internal reporting to management, reporting to law enforcement, or mobilizing a computer security incident response team (CSIRT). Agencies should develop procedures for internal and external reporting that will meet the needs of centralized reporting with little or no additional work.

Actions include:

1. Review incident reporting procedures to determine need for changes in what is reported and the reporting requirements.
 - a. Lead Entity: CIO
 - b. Timeframe: December 31, 2004
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task
2. Communicate reporting requirements to agencies.
 - a. Lead Entity: CIO
 - b. Timeframe: March 31, 2005
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task

D. Network Security and Network Management

DAS Division of Communications (DOC) has made changes to implement a layered approach to network security. DOC and many agencies have focused more attention on network management, including patch management, virus protection, and intrusion detection.

Actions include:

1. Configure all public state IP addresses (164.119) behind the state's firewall complex
 - a. Lead Entity: DOC
 - b. Timeframe: December 31, 2004
 - c. Funding: DOC
2. Implement an intrusion detection and prevention system on the State's Internet connection as a part of a layered defense.
 - a. Lead Entity: DOC

- b. Timeframe: March 31, 2005
 - c. Funding: DOC
- 3. Investigate and recommend an enterprise solution to ensure that encrypted traffic adheres to State security requirements.
 - a. Lead Entity: DOC
 - b. Timeframe: March 31, 2005
 - c. Funding: Funding not needed.
- 4. Evaluate and recommend options for providing encryption to clients across the state's Wide Area Network
 - a. Lead Entity: DOC
 - b. Timeframe: June 30, 2005
 - c. Funding: Funding not needed.

BUSINESS RESUMPTION

E. Promote disaster planning for information technology systems, in conjunction with agency business continuity plans

Disaster recovery plans for information technology must be linked to an overall agency business continuity plan. A strategy for security and business resumption must encourage completion of agency business continuity plans in order for disaster recovery plans for information technology to be effective. Because many agencies depend on DAS for networking and computing services, it is essential that DAS develop a disaster recovery plan for its facilities and services.

Actions include:

- 1. Conduct an "executive overview" briefing (orientation exercise) to state agencies (using either the State Government Council or the Security Work Group as a forum) explaining the progress and current and future activities in the development of disaster recovery plans.
 - a. Lead Entity: DAS – IMServices, DAS Division of Communications, and CIO
 - b. Timeframe: December 31, 2004
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task
- 2. Encourage agencies to develop agency business continuity plans and disaster plans for information technology by seeking funding sources, providing training on developing plans, and providing technical assistance. The focus should be at the business level.
 - a. Task: Identify funding sources
 - (1) Lead Entity: CIO
 - (2) Timeframe: November 30, 2004
 - (3) Funding: No funding required for this task
 - b. Task: Identify next set of agencies for developing business continuity plans
 - (1) Lead Entity: DAS Risk Management
 - (2) Timeframe: February 1, 2004

- (3) Funding: The cost of preparing business continuity plans by agency is itemized in the DAS contract. Sources of funding have not been identified.
- 3. Identify and develop procedures for common elements that should be addressed in all or most business continuity plans and disaster recovery plans for information technology.
 - a. Task: Investigate and communicate the availability of insurance to cover costs relating to replacement, repair and recovery services
 - (1) Lead Entity: DAS Risk Management (subject to approval by DAS)
 - (2) Timeframe: May 31, 2004
 - (3) Funding: No funding required for this task
 - b. Task: Develop and communicate policy and procedures for expedited purchasing of goods and services related to a disaster
 - (1) Lead Entity: DAS Materiel with DAS IMServices as a critical stakeholder (subject to approval by DAS)
 - (2) Timeframe: March 31, 2005
 - (3) Funding: No funding required for this task

F. Implement shared disaster recovery facilities

Mission critical systems have three common requirements. Recovery times must be measured in hours, not days or weeks. Recovery facilities should be physically separated so that they will not be affected by a single disaster. There must be staff available to assist with the recovery efforts. Achieving these requirements is very expensive. Sharing disaster recovery facilities, and establishing a collaborative approach to disaster recovery is one strategy for managing costs. DAS IMServices and the University of Nebraska are jointly developing a fast recovery capability using mutual assistance of physically separated data centers

Actions include:

- 1. Develop a shared recovery capacity serving state government and the University of Nebraska.
 - a. Lead Entity: DAS IMServices and NU
 - b. Timeframe: ongoing
 - c. Funding: The cost and source of funding have not been determined.
- 2. Conduct a briefing for state agency information technology staff (orientation exercise) describing the disaster recovery activities that will be performed by IMServices and the disaster recovery testing that has been completed.
 - a. Lead Entity: DAS IMServices
 - b. Timeframe: March 31, 2005
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task.

G. Encourage testing and updating of disaster plans

Testing is the only way to insure that a disaster recovery plan is adequate and the organization is able to implement its plan.

Actions include:

1. Evaluate current status of testing and recommend testing strategies for different kinds of systems
 - a. Lead Entity: CIO
 - b. Timeframe: June 30, 2005
 - c. Funding: No funding required for this task.